Brown University

Providence, Rhode Island

Fifth-year Interim Report to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges

January 2013

INTRODUCTION

Brown University's fifth-year interim report follows on the 2008 decennial self-study exercise, and the subsequent external evaluation and recommendations of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.[1] As documented in the following sections of this report, even during this short interval Brown has continued to advance in notable ways. We have made significant progress toward the major goals identified in our self-study, aided in part by the guidance we received from the NEASC evaluation team. At the same time, the last four years has been a period of significant turmoil due to the economic downturn and slow recovery, which has required innumerable recalibrations on specific matters. While we have not carried out every single process projected in 2008, this interim report accounts for how well we have adapted to changing and uncertain circumstances, maintained a clear focus on the most critical objectives, vigorously pursued an agenda of institutional improvement across the board, and strengthened our mechanisms of evaluation.

The preparation of this interim report was organized by the Office of the Provost and involved contributions from a broad range of campus constituents. Several of the major contributors previously served on the Steering Committee of the 2008 self-study and met with the visiting team in 2009; others assumed office after the last accreditation review. As a result, this interim report (like the University itself) benefits from both continuity of vision and fresh perspectives.

Notwithstanding the substantial challenges the University has faced (along with all its peer institutions) since the last accreditation cycle, Brown is an even stronger institution today than in 2008-09, and it is poised to become stronger yet. We have made good use of the guidance provided by the visiting committee and NEASC, and the process of preparing an interim report comes at a particularly opportune moment, in conjunction with the arrival of new University leadership and the formulation of new plans to build upon the advances of the last decade.

Provost Mark S. Schlissel provided overall direction for preparation of this interim report, in consultation with President Christina H. Paxson. Deputy Provost Joseph Meisel, Brown's NEASC liaison, played the key organizing role in this process. The institutional leaders who have contributed to the report include:

Katherine Bergeron, Dean of the College
Clyde Briant, Vice President for Research
Russell Carey, Executive Vice President for Planning and Policy
Susan Howitt, Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning
Elizabeth Huidekoper, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration
Margaret Klawunn, Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services
Beverley Ledbetter, Vice President and General Counsel
Stephen Maiorisi, Vice President for Facilities Management
Kevin McLaughlin, Dean of the Faculty

[1] In fact, this "fifth-year" report comes four years after the self-study because Brown was granted an extra year in order to incorporate the findings of a major review of the undergraduate curriculum.

James Miller, Dean of Admission
Michael Pickett, Vice President / CIO for Computing and Information Services
Marisa Quinn, Vice President for Public Affairs and University Relations
Richard Spies, former Executive Vice President for Planning and Interim Senior Vice President for University Advancement
James Tilton, Director of Financial Aid
Peter Weber, Dean of the Graduate School
Edward Wing, Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences

K. Tracy Barnes, Director of Institutional Research, oversaw the collection of assessment and student success data. In the Provost's office, Project Manager Elizabeth Love and Executive Assistant Lynda Murphy provided editorial and logistical support.

INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

Brown University was founded in 1764 as the College of Rhode Island, and renamed in 1804 in recognition of a gift from Nicholas Brown. A medical school was first established in 1811, but was suspended in 1827 and only revived in 1975; since 2007 it has been named the Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University. Brown was an early adopter of the research university model in America, and graduate programs were first introduced in 1887. A women's college, Pembroke, was established in 1891; in 1971 it merged with the [men's] College. In 2010, the Division of Engineering became the School of Engineering, and plans are underway to designate the Public Health Program as a school in 2013.

Brown's stated mission is "to serve the community, the nation, and the world by discovering, communicating, and preserving knowledge and understanding in a spirit of free inquiry, and by educating and preparing students to discharge the offices of life with usefulness and reputation." Part of Brown's distinction among its Ivy League peers is the expectation that faculty must be equally committed to both teaching and research. High expectations for teaching continue to be a major factor in evaluating faculty performance. The University also offers a unique curriculum that allows students to play a major, active role in shaping their own educational program. In general, Brown encourages innovation and multidisciplinary approaches to exploring intellectual problems and educating students. Approximately 6,000 undergraduates, some 2,000 graduate students, and more than 400 medical students are currently enrolled.

Over the last decade, under the leadership of former President Ruth J. Simmons, Brown's development has been guided by the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE), which sought to enhance the quality of Brown's academic programs and build up the supporting infrastructure. By increasing the size of the faculty, strengthening research opportunities, improving academic advising, expanding financial aid and graduate student funding, and extending its international reach, the University has further enhanced its formidable ability to deliver superior educational opportunities to its students and to support its surrounding community.

Christina H. Paxson became the University's 19th president in July, 2012. Provost Schlissel arrived at Brown one year earlier. Accordingly, this interim report comes at a juncture in the University's history when new leadership is in the midst of developing new plans in succession to the PAE that will guide Brown's actions and shape its aspirations in the years ahead. The submission of the report comes before those new plans, parameters, and emphases have been fully worked out, vetted by the campus community, and approved by the Corporation. While there is much to say about where we want to be heading, the extent to which we are still in process with the planning effort will be reflected in those parts of the report that look forward.

The achievements of the last decade have put Brown in a strong institutional position and, as described in this report, our continued efforts will ensure that we remain on a strong upward trajectory. Yet, we also face myriad challenges with which we will have to grapple in the next five years and beyond. We exist in a competitive landscape, and our peers are continuing to invest heavily in advancing their own excellence. Like our peers, we must also reckon with major changes in the educational landscape, particularly those relating to digital technology. Securing the resources we need to sustain our recent growth and realize our further academic aspirations will not be easy while economic conditions continue to constrain endowment growth, donor giving potential, and the family budgets of college students. As we seek to expand research activity, we will be competing for what is likely to be a level or even shrinking federal research budget. We are also affected by the fact that the city of Providence and state of Rhode Island remain particularly hard hit by the current economy.

We must these constraints and challenges into account as we frame our aspirations for the next decade and beyond, but must not lower our sights. We enter into this next phase of the University's nearly 250-year history with momentum, discipline, and a shared commitment across campus to the achievement of even greater and more innovative academic excellence.

I. AREAS IDENTIFIED FOR SPECIAL EMPHASIS

1. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN FOR ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT AND ADAPTATIONS RESULTING FROM ECONOMIC UNCERTAINTY

The NEASC evaluation team described the Plan for Academic Enrichment (PAE) as a "focused and guiding force" that provided a "strong, central, organizing focus" for Brown's ambitions. The strength of the Plan was never more obvious than in the University's response to the financial crisis of 2008-09 and the ensuing economic recession. Notwithstanding the need for major cost reductions, reorganization, and numerous adaptations, Brown adhered to the values and aspirations of the PAE and continued to move forward with its most important goals. Throughout, we were guided by several overarching principles: to preserve and, if possible, enhance our core academic programs and the student experience; to think strategically about how Brown is organized and how to provide efficient and responsive support structures; and to develop plans that are in accordance with our values as a community.

In the face of the unfolding financial crisis, the Corporation acted swiftly to create an ad hoc committee that identified the need to significantly reduce projected future budgets in light of a diminished endowment market value and likely declines in donor contributions. With this guidance from the Corporation, the administration responded to the immediate effects of the recession by curtailing our capital plans, freezing salaries, and slowing the pace of hiring. Those short-term actions enabled the University to carry out a more deliberate and detailed set of processes to realign administrative functions and increase income for the longer term. This effort ultimately identified more than $75 million in savings and additional revenue. As a result of these changes, Brown achieved a balanced budget in 2010-11 even while absorbing a 20% reduction in endowment payout.

All told, some 150 staff, faculty and students from across the University participated in an organizational review effort that helped Brown rethink its administrative structure to gain greater efficiency and effectiveness. Achieving that target required us to make some difficult and painful choices, including the elimination of roughly 200 (8%) administrative and support positions. We were able to make those reductions with a limited number of layoffs by offering a voluntary retirement program, and by replacing only critical staff openings. On the revenue side, Brown had the capacity for a small increase in undergraduate students (from around 5,800 in 2008-09 to around 6,000 in 2012-13) and to set higher net income objectives for some of our auxiliary operations.

In addition to reducing operating expenses, Brown revised its guidelines for capital projects to curtail new initiatives lacking external funding. The University cancelled the construction of a Mind-Brain-Behavior Building and instead carried out a more cost-effective renovation of an existing building for these academic uses that required no additional debt. A similar plan was implemented for the new Medical School building. Replacement of the Human Resources system and the building of an IT data center were deferred.

Ultimately, these measures enabled the University to continue meeting its academic goals and move forward with its most important initiatives notwithstanding reduced resources. In adapting to the new financial realities, the PAE also guided the University on where *not* to cut, especially regarding our commitments to undergraduate and graduate student financial aid, and to a strong faculty compensation program. Meanwhile, we invested additional resources to spur revenue growth and diversification (another PAE goal), including expanded support for faculty to obtain sponsored research funding (described under Special Emphasis Area 3: Research Infrastructure Support) and creation of new master's programs (described under Standard 4: Academic Program).

2. TENURE POLICIES AND PRACTICES REVIEW

The NEASC evaluation team raised a particular concern about the comparatively high rate at which Brown has historically promoted faculty to tenure, and urged the University to undertake a comprehensive review of the standards for tenure and promotion. During the 2009-10 academic year, then-Provost David Kertzer convened the ad hoc Committee on Tenure and Faculty Development, with the following charge:

> This committee has the broad charge of considering whether the University's current policies and processes governing faculty support and academic promotion are appropriate to Brown's status as one of the nation's leading research universities, particularly in light of investments in support of faculty that have been made through the Plan for Academic Enrichment. Among the issues:
>
> - Do Brown's hiring, reappointment, and tenure policies appropriately balance contributions to teaching, scholarship and service, and do they establish and maintain a high and consistent standard of excellence?
> - How do our tenure procedures compare with practices at nationally recognized peer institutions that place similar value on undergraduate education and major contributions to scholarship?
> - Is the current tenure "clock" adequately supportive of tenure-track faculty, giving them the time they need to launch their scholarly careers and demonstrate their capacity to produce significant works of original scholarship? Should we continue to maintain a single, University-wide tenure "clock"?
> - Are Brown's leave policies and teaching expectations for assistant professors comparable with policies at peer institutions? Are other forms of support for junior faculty competitive with those of peer institutions?

The Committee met throughout the year and consulted broadly, including with standing faculty committees, department chairs, individual faculty members, and students. It gathered data, reviewed tenure processes at Brown and elsewhere, and compared the size and composition of Brown's faculty to those of peer institutions. There was wide-ranging discussion amongst the faculty, including in open meetings. The Committee's March 2010 report, and the ensuing campus-wide discussions, resulted in a number of changes to policy (approved by faculty vote) as well as practice, the most significant of which are described below (see also Appendix I).

The Probationary Period

The period between initial appointment and the tenure review is a critical time for tenure-track faculty members. If the period is too short, even excellent candidates may not yet have established full-fledged, independent research programs, or sufficiently honed their teaching skills. Likewise, universities may have insufficient information on which to make informed decisions. If the period is too long, untenured faculty may become frustrated and discouraged. The optimal period probably varies by institution, by discipline, and by personal circumstances. The ad hoc Committee concluded that the standard six- or seven-year probationary period first promoted by the American Association of University Professors in 1940 may no longer serve us well in an era in which both professional and personal challenges for untenured faculty are considerably more acute than they were some 70 years ago. It recommended that the probationary period be extended from seven to eight years, with the tenure review conducted in the seventh year. Candidates may request an earlier review if appropriate, and extensions of contract for parenting responsibilities or extraordinary circumstances continue to be available.

Annual and Reappointment Reviews

Lengthening the probationary period has resulted in a first contract of four (rather than three) years, with the reappointment review at the beginning of the fourth year. There is thus a more substantial basis for evaluating assistant professors on the tenure track, and the recommendations for reappointment will now be based on a fuller record of research, teaching, and service. Tenure-track faculty are reviewed annually by the senior faculty in their departments and provided with a written evaluation of their performance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The Committee recommended that the timing of these reviews be changed slightly, to the early fall of each year, which aligns better with the calendar for reappointment and tenure reviews. Departments were also urged to make certain that the annual review process provides junior faculty with clear and helpful feedback about progress towards tenure. In order to ensure that the guidance provided is both adequate and consistent with University standards, annual reviews are now submitted in draft to the Dean for comment and approval before they are sent to the junior faculty under review.

Tenure Review

Academic tenure is awarded on the basis of demonstrated excellence and future promise, assessed through the department's evaluation of a candidate's accomplishments as a teacher and contributions as a scholar; careful solicitation of advice from recognized experts in the field; and comparison of the candidate with other promising and/or established scholars. The standard for such reviews should be sufficiently rigorous to ensure that tenure is granted only to faculty who are likely to be leaders in their fields, excellent teachers and mentors, and contributors to the welfare of the University community. Changes intended to improve the tenure review process focused on ensuring that the review of the candidate's work by the outside evaluators would be rigorous and objective, and that the quality of information on which the tenure decision was based would therefore be as high as possible. To that end, the minimum number of letters was increased from five to eight, the role of the Dean in evaluating the suitability of referees was expanded, and the practice of permitting the candidate to know the identities of referees was discontinued.

Measurement and Assessment

The new policies and procedures surrounding junior faculty reviews and the granting of tenure aim at promoting and sustaining high academic standards. At the institutional level, these changes must also be accompanied by maintaining a healthy balance with respect to tenure. Based on a study of internal and comparative data, the proposed overall target range for the tenure ratio is 70-75%. The hiring of assistant professors under the PAE faculty expansion helped reduce Brown's tenure ratio from a high of 82% in 2000-01 to approximately 75% currently. Thus, in order to remain within the target range in the coming years, we will need to pay careful attention to the rate at which each cohort of junior faculty receives tenure.

Cohort tenure rate cannot be controlled directly by policy short of setting an arbitrary numerical cap, which we think would provide the wrong kinds of incentives to departments and discourage the best young scholars from accepting offers at Brown. The goal is not to have our Tenure Promotions and Appointment Committee deny tenure to more assistant professors; rather, through our revised policies and practices, we want to give departments the right set of guidance, support, and incentives to set the bar high and ensure that fewer marginal cases come forward for review. The administration is working with the Faculty Executive Committee and departments on how to manage the tenure ratio using a variety of mechanisms, including new or revised procedures for hiring plans, search requests, negative tenure decisions, and retirement.

The impact of these changes cannot yet be fully ascertained, since these policies and procedures have only been recently implemented. However, departments have adapted well to the procedural changes, and the focus of attention on tenure over the last few years has promoted a better general understanding of the importance for Brown of strengthening its practices in this area. In the coming years, we will carefully consider how to utilize new and existing measures to systematically evaluate the quality of our tenure decisions as well as the composition of our faculty. The Corporation Academic Affairs Committee, which was closely involved in the deliberations over strengthening the tenure process, has also charged the administration to provide regular reports on junior faculty reappointment reviews, tenure decisions, cohort tenure rate, tenure ratio, and other measures of overall faculty quality. These reports will allow us to track important trend data across years, departments and across different faculty demographics.

3. RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

The University has made significant progress in addressing the NEASC evaluation team's recommendations relating to Brown's physical and technological resources. We have also addressed other relevant needs and priorities identified through ongoing campus processes.

Computing

In 2009, Brown invested more than $2 million in high performance computing capacity, including the purchase of an IBM supercomputer that is capable of performing more than 14 trillion calculations per second and provides 4.5 terabytes of memory for our researchers. This investment provided Brown faculty with much greater computing capabilities than had been available in the past. Also, by centralizing the facilities in the Center for Computation and Visualization (CCV), Brown offered researchers a much more economical method of accessing high performance computing capabilities than would have been the case if each research group purchased its own equipment. Since the initial investment in 2009, the computing capacity has grown by more than a factor of five, and the number of users annually has grown from around 100 to roughly 500.

A critical factor in the growth of users for this equipment has been Brown's commitment to providing staff expertise to guide faculty and students in the use of the equipment. The University has hired domain experts in the fields of bioinformatics and computational chemistry. In the budget for 2012-13, additional funding was approved to create a new position in CCV to focus on working with scholars in the social sciences and the humanities. In addition, CCV has begun to offer a training program to teach faculty and students about the type of programming that can be done with this equipment.

To further facilitate computer-intensive research, Brown has also recently implemented an NSF-funded upgrade to the optical network in a portion of campus to support transfer of large datasets, high definition video, and connectivity to Internet2 at broadband speeds.

While it is difficult to predict the budget required for growth in this rapidly-changing field, the additional investment required over the next 10 years to support increasing use of computation and data storage needs could amount to $15 million.

Core Research Facilities

Brown currently has 14 core facilities (split evenly between the Division of Biology and Medicine and the rest of the campus), which contain broadly useful instrumentation housed in and managed by academic departments and centers, but available to investigators from anywhere on campus (and beyond) through charge-back mechanisms. Historically, most research equipment was obtained through federal grants awarded to individual investigators (particularly through the NSF Major Research Instrumentation Grant Program and NIH's Shared Instrumentation Grant Program and High-End Instrumentation Grant Program), and University matching funds. In many areas, however, the evolution of new equipment is rapid, and maintaining state-of-the-art research infrastructure cannot simply rely upon federal grant funds. Regular institutional investment is required. Recently, for example, the University committed approximately $5 million for shared instrumentation and associated facilities renovations for structural biology. While this commitment was initially prompted by a retention case, we have carried out these investments in a manner designed to enhance our broader capabilities and to aid in future faculty recruitment.

During 2011-12, the Office of the Vice President for Research and the Provost's office instituted a more systematic approach to identifying research facility needs and supporting equipment acquisition. This exercise suggested that Brown would need to invest on the order of $10 million to bring its core facilities up to currently accepted levels. As a result of this study, the Provost has allocated $2 million annually over the next three years, for a total of $6 million:

half of these funds are designated for facilities supporting work in the area of Brain Science (one of Brown's major initiatives), with the other half to be allocated to core facilities in other areas of research. During the first year, it is expected that all of these resources will be used for purchasing equipment. In the following years, some of these funds are expected to be used for cost-sharing in federal grant competitions.

Core facility faculty directors will be surveyed periodically regarding the new or replacement instrumentation that they consider highest priority in order to advance Brown's research capabilities. The survey data include detail on the requested equipment as well as the user base and anticipated installation and operations costs. A faculty-administration team will prioritize the requests and allocate funds, which in general are expected to be used as matching funds in federal grant competitions.

Given the current needs and the unanticipated opportunities that may arise with new equipment, we anticipate spending roughly \$30 million on research equipment over the next ten years with the expectation that around half of this amount would come from federal grants and the other half from University investment. On average, renovation costs associated with new equipment are around 25% of the cost of the equipment; accordingly, Brown will also need to plan for some \$7.5 million of renovations in this category.

Other Research Infrastructure Needs

Laboratory space and other research infrastructure needs are evaluated through the centralized capital planning process and the Provost's Space Committee. The Provost's office receives requests from departments for new space allocations, whether in conjunction with incremental hiring or due to expanding research activities of the existing faculty. Through weekly coordinating meetings with the Director of Planning, the Associate Provost ensures that the Space Committee discusses, initiates, and launches the construction projects necessary to accommodate ongoing departmental initiatives. The annual budget for this activity is approximately \$5 million.

As existing laboratory buildings reach capacity (which happens to be the case at present), pressure builds both for more efficient use of lab space and for construction of new laboratories. Brown is anticipating faculty growth over the next several years in the School of Engineering and in Brain Science, which will necessitate major new research facilities. The \$35 million renovation of the Brown Environmental Research and Teaching Building (formerly Hunter Lab) now underway involves an unusual cross-disciplinary grouping of faculty with interests in environmental science and engineering. It will meet short-term needs for incremental hires in the School of Engineering, the Department of Geological Sciences, and other units. A major infrastructure renewal project for the Barus and Holley building (School of Engineering and Department of Physics) and Prince Laboratories (Engineering) is also getting underway. Its first phase calls for \$12 million in building systems upgrades; ultimately, however, the expenditure for the full project will be double that amount.

The next new building for laboratory research is in the early planning stage. It is part of the plan for growing the School of Engineering, although it is possible that the building could have an interdisciplinary focus. The process at this point is broadly consultative with the faculty regarding program goals, configuration of spaces, and special infrastructure needs. Once the budget, location, and specific program components are resolved through the strategic planning process, a project team will be assembled with representation from various academic units as well as the administration and Facilities Management. The budget for this project is not yet known, but is likely to exceed $100 million and may be as much as $200 million.

Physical Plant Renewal and Assessment

The 2009 review noted that Brown's $8 million annual budget for campus renewal falls short of the estimated need, and had driven Facilities Management to emphasize preventive maintenance in order to extend the life of building systems and envelopes. It was also noted that, while this strategy has been effective so far, there was some risk of increasing levels of deferred maintenance and system failures.

Brown continues to pursue a robust preventive maintenance program; in order to address the campus renewal needs directly, however, the University has also allocated significant capital funding to supplement the annual budget allocation. In the capital program that is drawing to a close, major investments in existing academic and student life facilities addressed both physical renewal needs and programmatic development. Two recent examples are the total renovation of the Metcalf building for the Department of Cognitive, Linguistic, and Psychological Sciences, and of Faunce House for the Stephen Robert '62 Campus Center. Currently, a number of residence halls are in the process of being renewed and modernized in conjunction with a new plan for residential life (described further under Standard 6: Student Life, and Standard 8: Physical and Technological Resources).

In addition to these major projects, Facilities Management has launched a comprehensive energy conservation program that, when fully implemented, is estimated to provide $4 million in annual savings that will be used to fund facility renewal projects. To date, we have been able to realize $1 million of that savings on an annual basis, which has already begun to extend the renewal budget.

The NEASC evaluation team observed that it had been 15 years since a full comprehensive external facilities audit was done on the campus and expressed its concern that, without doing such an audit on a more regular basis, some facilities problems may have gone undetected and others may not be fully understood. The report further noted that it is particularly valuable to have such an audit during a period of time when renewal resources are scarce.

In January 2010, Brown engaged Sightlines, LLC to conduct an integrated facilities assessment that provided a comprehensive view of campus renewal needs. This study and the resulting data have been instrumental in improving the University's process for allocating the renewal funds that are available in the most effective manner. Sightlines is now completing a reassessment to update the data. We intend to continue with reassessments every two or three years, and to use the net asset value analysis to adjust renewal priorities and to promote optimal stewardship of the campus physical resources.

The increased annual capital allocation and continuing renovation projects should enable Brown to meet campus renewal needs in the future, even as those needs are assessed more frequently and comprehensively.

Research Support Services and Programs

The Office of the Vice President for Research also provides key infrastructure for the development and execution of Brown's research mission. Over the last several years, Brown has made a number of investments in expanding the office's capacity to support faculty engaged in sponsored research. New staff have been added in key areas, including the Research Protections and Sponsored Projects offices, to enable the University to keep up with new requirements for recipients of federal research awards. Additional staff resources were also added to help increase the faculty's ability to develop proposals for large, multi-investigator grants. Also, the University has enlarged the pool of funding for internal seed grants aimed at attracting more sponsored research awards. A newly-created position, Deputy Vice President for Research, held by a tenured faculty member, focuses on building additional collaborative research programs that will contribute to Brown's growing research profile.

4. STRENGTHENING THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Brown is providing better grounding, support, tools, resources, and visibility for its graduate students so that they can more fully participate in the life of the University, succeed in their studies, develop as professionals, and contribute to their fields. The basic measures of program quality continue to improve. Applications to the Graduate School have risen substantially over the last five years; in 2012 the number of applicants was 28% greater than in 2008. Selectivity for doctoral programs is now less than 10%, which is on a par with the College. The number of prestigious external fellowships and honors awarded to Brown graduate students nearly tripled from 35 in 2008 to 91 in 2012. The median number of years between initial registration and award of the PhD in each division is less than national norms.

Over the last five years, graduate students have benefitted from significant improvements to financial provisions, new or strengthened programmatic opportunities, and increased attention to advising and mentoring. On the financial front, Brown now provides more generous support and greater clarity for graduate students so that they can better plan their doctoral studies. Five-year guaranteed funding for all students was introduced in 2006, and since then we have been increasing stipends to ensure that graduate support is both adequate for student needs and sufficient to attract the most able students to Brown's programs. The Dean of the Graduate School has made it a priority to improve the relative position of Brown's base stipends for doctoral students. Since 2008, base stipends have increased by 13.2%. Brown's stipend is currently below the median of "Ivy Plus" peers, but higher than the stipends (normalized to nine months) of Princeton, Berkeley, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Beginning with the cohort of doctoral students that started in 2010, the number of summers for which funds are guaranteed was increased to four. While this was a welcome extension of financial support, it remains the case that the summer month stipends we currently offer ($2,500) are below those supported by our competitors. The Dean of the Graduate School is developing a set of proposals that will give students greater flexibility to deploy summer support funds to greatest effect for their academic needs.

In 2011, the Graduate School reorganized resources, previously distributed in an ad hoc manner, to create a clear, merit-based system of additional support for doctoral students who have a well-developed plan and schedule for completion but whose work requires one additional year beyond the five-year period of guaranteed funding. (The students' home departments, which must endorse their proposals, are also invited to contribute resources for this purpose.) More generally, the school has promoted a culture in which graduate students compete for and win external funding.

A new program, being piloted with a major grant from the Mellon Foundation as well as internal resources, enables selected doctoral students to pursue a secondary master's degree in another field of their choosing related to current and future research interests. Called the Open Graduate Education program, this initiative provides participating students an opportunity to develop cutting-edge interdisciplinary research interests with a level of rigor and sophistication that will further strengthen their development as scholars and which will make them more competitive on the job market. At the same time, this distinctive program moves our approach to graduate education into closer alignment with the spirit of Brown's undergraduate Open Curriculum. The Graduate School has also reorganized and refocused proctorship appointments (i.e., non-instructional positions) to ensure that they better serve the professional development of the graduate students selected for these positions.

In recent years, Brown has strengthened the graduate advising and mentoring guidelines for faculty as well as the resources it provides to assist graduate students in forging productive relationships. Beginning in 2010, this initiative has been underscored by an annual prize to recognize an outstanding faculty mentor of graduate students. Since 2011, incoming graduate students have also benefitted from the guidance provided by a new tutorial program to convey and reinforce Brown's academic and student conduct codes, aligning practice with the College and strengthening our students' grounding in a culture that fosters free inquiry. In 2012, completing this tutorial became mandatory.

Beyond formal advising structures, Brown has made great strides recently in its efforts to support graduate students within the wider campus culture. Graduate students and their successes are more visible to the Brown community in a variety of ways: in stories, quotes, and photos on *brown.edu*, in *The Brown Insider* (the alumni e-newsletter), in fundraising materials, and other media channels; through social media for current students and alumni, including Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter; by revamping the orientation mobile site to include information for graduate students; and by extending a warm welcome to new graduate students, with the University president addressing them at orientation for the fourth consecutive year.

5. STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT

Responses to the questions raised in connection with this Special Emphasis Area are incorporated into the discussion in Part III: Assessment, Retention, and Student Success.

II. STANDARDS

1. MISSION

The PAE catalyzed the development of Brown's mission, affirming the centrality of excellent teaching and educational programs while also enlarging the scale and scope of research activity on campus. We were greatly encouraged by the NEASC evaluation team's assertion that "it is possible for Brown to excel in both research and teaching without losing the culture that is so valued by the community." The report also noted that it will take time for all members of the community to embrace the change. Over the last five years, there has been considerable progress on this front, and the involvement of groups across the campus in discussions around the new planning effort will be an opportunity to further evolve our culture.

The perceived tension between research and education is a false dichotomy. Brown is justly proud of its long and distinguished history of research and graduate training in a wide range of fields (our faculty's central contribution to theorizing the Higgs boson is one particularly notable recent example). It is also the case that very few applicants to the College who are offered admission choose to go to a liberal arts college instead; rather, the vast majority of those who do not accept Brown's offer opt to attend larger research universities. And, indeed, the extent of opportunities Brown provides for undergraduates to be directly involved in important research under leading scholars and scientists has long been an institutional hallmark. The (for us) essential interconnectedness of education and research is a central consideration in the current planning effort.

The PAE, and the trajectory on which it has set Brown for the future, reflect the recognition that, in the present era, doing justice to our mission of public service, discovery and preservation of knowledge, and educating students, means competing nationally and globally for the best faculty and students and being capable of supporting their endeavors. While some tension between older and newer visions of the University was evident, the recent experience of reforming the tenure process (see Special Emphasis Area 2: Tenure Policies and Practices Review) and the subsequent implementation was also a defining moment for achieving broader consensus around the value of academic excellence in scholarship at Brown alongside an unrelenting insistence on high-quality teaching.

The results of the current strategic planning exercise will also play an important part in further developing and extending Brown's mission going forward, for example in relation to the area of online education both within and beyond Brown.

2. PLANNING, EVALUATION, AND ASSESSMENT

Since the 2008 self-study, Brown has continued to move forward with the goals and aspirations of the PAE, even in the face of considerable financial challenges (see Special Emphasis Area 1: Implementation of the Plan for Academic Enrichment and Adaptations Resulting from Economic Uncertainty). Brown also continued to review and adapt the PAE right up to the time when President Simmons announced her intention to step down in June, 2012. The wide array of improvements implemented under the PAE is cataloged cumulatively, and in detail in the September 2011 Status Report (Appendix II).

Looking forward, the PAE has positioned the campus well for the years ahead. The nearly 20% growth in the size of the faculty, construction of new and renovated facilities, and expansion of our graduate programs have all increased Brown's capacity for teaching and research. Implementing need-blind admission for most undergraduate applicants and increasing our internationalization efforts have invigorated and diversified our academic community. Our recently completed agreement to help support Providence in its time of economic crisis has improved our relationship with government leaders and should result in productive collaborations with the city as we endeavor to enhance and expand the campus. Finally, because of the generous support of our alumni and friends and prudent management of campus resources, Brown's finances are in relatively good shape despite the challenging financial climate. New or enhanced programs will require new resources, but our basic financial model is sound. The new planning effort does not aim at supplanting the PAE, but rather concentrates on the ways that Brown can most effectively build on and develop from the PAE's success.

Faculty

The 2009 evaluation team cited the need for more systematic and rigorous evaluation of faculty. As described in detail in Special Emphasis Area 2: Tenure Policies and Practices Review, much has been done over the last few years to institute a new set of practices around faculty evaluation and the awarding of tenure and to monitor the results of these changes. In addition, we have been taking a number of other steps to gauge overall faculty quality and track how our investment in adding faculty is producing a commensurate increase in overall quality. The strengthened process of departmental reviews and data from Academic Analytics, both described below, provide considerable information on faculty research, teaching effort, and service.

The widespread adoption of online course evaluations (described in Part III: Assessment, Retention, and Student Success) has resulted in more and better data about teaching, which can be used for mentoring and reviewing faculty. Along with the greater emphasis that has been placed on advising in both undergraduate and graduate programs, we are paying more attention to clarifying the place of advising in expectations for faculty, and also considering the best way to capture student evaluations of their advisors. Additionally, we are investing in VIVO, a software platform for collection and dissemination, both within the academy and beyond, of detailed information about faculty research activities in order to encourage collaboration and make faculty expertise more accessible.

Departments and Centers

Assessment of academic departments and programs is overseen by the Academic Priorities Committee (chaired by the Provost and consisting of faculty and senior academic deans) in conjunction with the Academic Program Reviews process organized by the Provost's office. Each department or program scheduled for review is provided with standardized reports containing a wealth of data on undergraduate and graduate programs, faculty, and research activity. These reports are then used by departments to aid their preparation of self-studies, in which departments are asked to articulate their academic mission, goals, and projections along with the particular challenges or opportunities they face in the drive for excellence (see Appendix III). These materials provide an overview of departmental strengths and weaknesses for the internal and external committees that meet with the academic unit's faculty, faculty in related departments, graduate and undergraduate students, and deans.

The Academic Priorities Committee reviews the internal and external committee reports as well as the department's response. Following a discussion with the department chair, the Committee issues a letter providing the department with guidance or direction on the key issues raised in the review process, and a set of expectations against which future performance can be gauged. In the year following this process, departments are reviewed again by the College Curriculum Council and the Graduate Council, which produce reports on their educational programs. In combination with the external departmental reviews, the regularization of reviewing undergraduate and graduate curricula has had an overall salutary effect by ensuring that close attention is being paid before significant problems emerge.

The outcomes of departmental reviews to date represent a broad spectrum from incremental adjustments and improvements to dramatic changes. In some instances, reviews have called attention to issues across a number of units, for example the difficulties that interdisciplinary programs with faculty lines encounter when trying to recruit scholars that, at Brown, can have tenure homes only in discipline-based departments. In the last few years, several reviews have been highly consequential for departments. The review of the Literary Arts program in 2010 led to its elevation to departmental status and justified increased investment. In the wake of the 2011 review of the Watson Institute for International Studies, the director resigned and a major set of structural reforms was carried out under interim leadership. The programmatic renewal that was also called for in the review awaits the arrival of the newly appointed director (political scientist Richard Locke, from MIT), who will begin his tenure on July 1, 2013. A joint review of the Center for Environmental Studies and the Environmental Change Initiative in 2011, premised on the idea of forming a merged department, resulted instead in the rejection of creating a single unit at this time; a reassessment of the mission, structure, and program of the Center; and additional investment in the Initiative.

The departmental review process has been supported by an Assessment Archive, in which materials from the various phases of review are stored. To augment our data resources for departmental evaluation, Brown recently made an initial commitment to subscribe to Academic Analytics, an aggregator of university data that provides a set of tools for comparative evaluation of faculty research quality and productivity. The Provost's office worked with the chairs of six departments to test the ways in which the Academic Analytics data could be most useful for departmental-level planning and decision-making. The data were subsequently made available to all department chairs, along with guidance and support based on the recommendations of the six chairs in the pilot program. This year we will learn how useful this data is for both University- and department-level decision-making.

The Provost recently clarified and strengthened future plans for the departmental review process. Reviews will occur on a cycle of approximately seven years, with a substantial mid-course evaluation and discussion of progress toward goals articulated in the previous full review.

In addition to establishing a regular arc of assessment to help structure departmental efforts, this plan will also ensure that the findings and recommendations of undergraduate and graduate educational program reviews are better integrated back into the full range of departmental planning and evaluation. By the time of our next 10-year review in 2018, when a full cycle of this enhanced assessment regime will have been completed for some departments, we will be able to provide an update on the effectiveness of the process.

While some of Brown's major centers and institutes have been included in the departmental review process, over the last year we have been working toward a more systematic process of evaluating all centers and similar bodies. In 2011-12, at the behest of the Provost, the Vice President for Research charged his Research Advisory Board, composed of faculty members, to propose a set of guidelines for assessing centers, institutes, and non-departmental programs, including evaluative criteria, data collection, review processes, and procedures for closing units. The guidelines also call for establishing a regular review cycle, perhaps every five years, that sets short- and long-term goals, defines benchmarks, and helps align the activities of centers with the University's larger academic plans. Going forward, further work to develop clearer definitions of types of centers, programs, and institutes is required, as is more discussion of the criteria by which they should be assessed. By the time of our next ten-year review, we expect that a systematic review process for centers, institutes, and similar bodies will be in place, as well as criteria that would allow for the closure of centers no longer accomplishing their stated goals.

Educational Programs

As noted above, reviews of concentrations and graduate programs take place in the year following the departmental reviews, and are informed by the issues raised in departments' self studies and external committee reports. These and other evaluative processes are discussed further under Standard 4: Academic Program.

A good understanding of what our graduates go on to do after leaving Brown is also critical for assessing the goals, outcomes, and efficacy of our educational programs. Additionally, the educational programs themselves are also strengthened by closer connection with alumni who can provide curricular participation, professional networks, and financial support. Data collection on alumni has not been organized as effectively as it should be on an institution-wide basis. To begin to address this shortcoming, the Director of Institutional Research has convened a group with representatives from Advancement, Alumni Affairs, career services ("CareerLAB"), the Division of Biology and Medicine, the Graduate School, and the Alpert Medical School to develop a process for collecting information about alumni at five and ten years following graduation.

3. ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

As noted in our self-study, Brown has devoted significant attention and resources to organization and governance over the past ten years. The systematic reviews of governance conducted by both the Corporation and the faculty early in President Simmons's administration realized benefits throughout her tenure. The University engages in continual review of organization and governance in order to ensure ongoing improvement and excellence in the methods we use to make decisions and implement policy. Additionally, new or improved governance practices in particular areas of the University are noted in some of the following sections.

The evaluation team made several observations with regard to membership of the Corporation, in particular commenting on the importance of having members from the academic world and representation of younger alumni. Since the NEASC team's visit, the Corporation has considered these matters and made several appointments and changes to their structure consistent with the goals set forth in the evaluation. New members, such as a Fellow appointed in 2009 who is a Brown PhD alumna in geological sciences and a leader in her field, have brought valuable perspectives and deeper understanding of the academy to the Corporation's deliberations.

The other significant structural change was the creation of a Young Alumni Trustee position in 2009. Young Alumni Trustees are elected by the Corporation in a manner similar to other Trustees, but in order to be eligible individuals must begin their terms no more than seven years after concluding their studies at Brown. Young Alumni Trustees serve three-year terms, rather than the six years served by other Trustees, in order to ensure that the Corporation's connection remains fresh. This position has been highly successful, and three Young Alumni Trustees have been elected to the Corporation since the 2009 review. Members in this position have contributed to Corporation discussions in an effective manner, and have earned the respect of their fellow members. The Corporation anticipates continuing to elect Young Alumni Trustees in the years to come.

Another significant development with regard to governance since 2009 was the need to launch an international search for Brown's 19th president in the fall of 2011. While the selection of the president is the sole responsibility of the Corporation, successful fulfillment of that responsibility required an inclusive process, involving active communication and engagement with alumni, faculty, students, and staff. The Corporation was fully committed to that principle, and designed a search process consistent with achieving those aims.

Chancellor Tisch formed a Presidential Search Committee of the Corporation, which was aided and advised by a Campus Advisory Committee. The creation of two committees was consistent with Brown's custom and tradition in selecting a president over the past several decades. It was very much a partnership, with members of both committees meeting jointly and participating actively throughout the search process. The Campus Advisory Committee, which was led by a faculty chair and vice-chair, was comprised of members of the faculty, including the Alpert Medical School faculty; student representatives from the College, the Graduate School, and the Alpert Medical School; and representatives of the staff. The two committees worked closely and effectively together, traveling the country in small groups to meet candidates, interviewing semi-finalists and finalists, and developing a joint recommendation to the Corporation. At the campus event announcing the election of Christina H. Paxson as Brown's 19th president, both Chancellor Tisch and Campus Advisory Committee chair Professor Chung-I Tan spoke of the value and importance of the collaborative process. In many respects, the governance efforts undertaken over the past 10 years, which sought to bring persons and groups together to more effectively lead and govern the University, was fully realized in the presidential search this year.

Efforts have been made to improve governance in other ways as well. The *Handbook of Academic Administration*, which is relied upon by faculty, especially department chairs, as a guide to policies and procedures, was long overdue for revision. In 2009, the *Handbook* was significantly updated, bringing it into conformity with new faculty rules and current practices, and reorganized to make it clearer and more accessible. The Dean of the Faculty's office now updates the *Handbook* annually, to reflect any changes in policy introduced during the preceding year and to clarify practices as needed. Moreover, to the extent that effective governance relies not only on written policy but on communication and transparency, the recent appointment of an ombudsperson charged with mediation and conflict resolution is an important development.

The 2009 report commented on the relatively low proportion of faculty active in faculty governance, noting that most major committees were staffed by the same group of faculty leaders. While this issue is not unique to Brown, the committee felt that to some extent the success of the PAE should be reflected in the engagement of a broader spectrum of faculty in the business of governance. Recent years have seen some progress in this area: a number of faculty who are relatively new to Brown have served on major University committees such as the University Resources Committee, the Academic Priorities Committee, and the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee. A large number of faculty (36) are participating on committees set up for the 2012-13 strategic planning process. We anticipate that a side benefit of this process will be to engage many faculty in university-wide matters for the first time.

Finally, the deliberation and consideration of proposed reforms to the faculty tenure process (see Special Emphasis Area 2: Tenure Policies and Practices Review) in 2010-11 represented another significant test of the efficacy of faculty governance. While at times contentious, in many respects the process was one of real and substantive debate and many representatives of the Corporation, the faculty, and the administration worked hard to arrive at outcomes that addressed challenges and shortcomings identified by the NEASC visiting team. Other difficult issues have arisen over the past five years, including the scope and breadth of varsity athletic programs, matters of social justice and responsibility, the role of ROTC at Brown, and debate about the cost of higher education. In discussions on these and other issues, the University's governance processes have provided the basis for respectful and meaningful debate and, often, change for the better. Governance is and remains daily work, and the University is committed to maintaining the standard of excellence commended by the NEASC team.

4. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

A. Undergraduate Program

The College has been engaged in a concerted effort over the last four years to strengthen programs and services in three major areas: the curriculum, advising structures, and assessment of teaching and student learning. This section of our report describes improvements in our curricular and advising programs, as well as our increasing efforts to understand how emerging online technologies can enhance the undergraduate experience at Brown. We also briefly summarize the state of campus discussion relating to the new federal credit hour standard. Our work in the area of assessing student learning is taken up in Part III: Assessment, Retention, and Student Success.

Concentration Reviews

In its 2008 report, the University's Task Force on Undergraduate Education directed the College to engage in a comprehensive review of all concentration programs. Now an established feature of our evaluation practices, these reviews ensure that all concentration programs meet College standards for breadth, depth, continuity, and synthesis of learning. Special attention is paid to clearly articulated learning outcomes, writing, and senior-year culminating experiences. Information about each concentration's learning goals, course of study, and other relevant information is housed in our new concentration search engine, Focal Point (described in more detail below). All of our 78 concentration programs now have articulated learning goals for students in Focal Point, and, to date, 33 of these programs have undergone full review with the College Curriculum Council (CCC). An additional 14 concentrations will be assessed this academic year.[2] By the end of 2012-13, therefore, we will have reviewed 60% of our concentrations in five years. Assuming our current pace of review continues, the College will have reviewed all concentration programs before our next full reaccreditation self-study is due in 2018.

The review process, which occurs in the year following the external departmental review (see Standard 2: Planning, Evaluation, and Assessment), typically involves a subcommittee of the CCC visiting the department to discuss a concentration's curriculum and learning outcomes, advising and mentoring systems, and culminating senior-year experiences. The visiting subcommittee produces a report describing what they have learned from faculty and students in the concentration. The department responds to the report, after which department representatives join the full CCC for a discussion about their program's structure and goals. Such meetings invariably include discussions about writing, senior capstones, and departmental methods for assessing exiting seniors. The CCC then produces a summary letter of that meeting, identifying areas of strength and pinpointing issues that need attention. Departments are expected to report on their progress in addressing areas needing improvement.

Recent reviews of the English and Economics concentrations illustrate how the process can inform departmental decision-making about undergraduate programs. When the English concentration was reviewed in November 2010, the department had already engaged in a thorough study of its program and submitted a set of proposed concentration changes to the CCC. The CCC visiting committee affirmed the value of such changes, which aimed to create a shared experience for concentrators in the form of a three-course common core and a required senior seminar.[3] CCC members also provided information from other concentration reviews that helped the English department enhance expectations for honors and adjust advising structures to

[2] Concentrations under review this year: Sociology, Philosophy, Geological Sciences (which incorporates four different concentrations), History of Art and Architecture, Urban Studies, Judaic Studies, Egyptology, Ancient Western Asian Studies, Classics, and Religious Studies. Environmental Studies is undergoing a semester-long review with a full committee.

[3] The three topics-based courses, numbered 0210, 0410, and 0610, are designed to ground students in the history of literature in English. The senior seminars were first offered in the 2011-12 academic year. Seminars for 2012-13 are ENGL 1950C: Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf? and ENGL 1950D: American Literature and the Corporation.

assure continuity of advising across the years.

The Economics concentration – one of Brown's largest – was reviewed in March 2012.[4] The department used the process to address concerns raised in its external review along with the standard questions outlined by the CCC (see Appendix IV). In advance of the review, the department supplied a set of documents related to program goals as well as advising and assessment in the concentration (see Appendix V). The CCC committee concurred with many of the department's own conclusions about its concentration, such as the need for more econometrics and math-econ courses. The visiting committee also helped the department think about ways to integrate writing into concentration courses, to offer more elective courses with limited enrollments (a recommendation that came out of the external review), and to create a forum for faculty to assess exiting seniors' success in meeting concentration learning goals. The review process resulted in a more rigorous concentration program that now includes a senior capstone opportunity in a smaller course environment.

The CCC review process described above suffices for the vast majority of concentrations, but selected programs have been examined in a more extensive semester-long process, usually because the issues they face are complex and not amenable to easy resolution. Three programs have undergone such reviews in the last two years: International Relations; Development Studies; and Commerce, Organizations, and Entrepreneurships (now Business, Entrepreneurship, and Organizations). All three concentrations are interdisciplinary programs without departmental homes. As such, they face special difficulties in staffing core courses, sequencing track requirements, and ensuring meaningful capstone experiences for all concentrators. The NEASC visiting committee addressed this very issue in its 2009 report, when it encouraged the University to strengthen the International Relations concentration in particular.[5]

International Relations is one of our largest concentrations, trailing only Economics and Biological Sciences in the number of concentrators they have graduated in the last ten years.[6] The IR review, conducted in fall 2010, resulted in a set of curricular and administrative changes that enhance student learning and promote understanding of global issues across the University (see Appendix VI). The reviews of Development Studies and Commerce, Organizations, and Entrepreneurship, like the IR review, produced clear concentration program goals, more logically sequenced courses, and more rigorous concentration experiences overall, including required senior capstone experiences. The incoming director of the Watson Institute (which houses the International Relations and Development Studies concentrations) intends to strengthen the relationships between the Institute and its allied departments, which will make for better student experiences. Another intensive concentration review, this time of Environmental Studies, is currently underway.

Advising and Academic Support

---

[4] With one or two exceptions, the Economics concentration has been among the top five concentrations completed each year for the last 20 years.
[5] Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, [and] Students of Brown University, p.15.
[6] In each of the last ten years, IR has graduated between 96 and 157 concentrators, with an annual average of 126 graduating students in the same period.

Over the last few years, the College has developed and launched several new tools that provide comprehensive information to students and their advisors. Chief among these is ASK, or "Advising Sidekick."[7] Initially introduced three years ago and improved and expanded since then, ASK provides both students and advisors with a single point of access for all of the information they need to work together effectively. Through a secured site, advisors and advisees can find To-Do lists, notices of deadlines and events, and student academic history. Every curricular decision that students make is stored in ASK: course selections, concentration declarations, and writing samples are all available for each student. ASK's functionality with respect to writing assessment in particular is detailed below in Part III: Assessment, Retention, and Student Outcomes.

ASK is still a new and developing tool; we are very encouraged by its early track record, but recognize it will take time for faculty and students to make full use of the growing range of functions it can support. ASK and other new advising resources (like those described below) have been well received by both advisors and students, who report them to be very helpful for academic planning and for facilitating advising conversations. For example, an editorial from the *Brown Daily Herald*, our student newspaper, applauds "recent advances by the University to improve undergraduate advising with practical web-based tools." More systematic data comes from recent survey results, which suggest that our efforts have significantly increased students' satisfaction with advising across all four years. This change is especially true for our sophomores, whose satisfaction with advising has historically been the lowest of any class. In 2007, only 33% of responding sophomores were satisfied with the quality of advising.[8] In 2011, by contrast, an astounding 74% of our sophomores reported satisfaction with advising – more than double their satisfaction rating in 2007. It should be noted that all classes reported higher rates of satisfaction with advising in 2011.[9]

For the later undergraduate years, new web-based tools have also transformed the College's ability to communicate about our 78 concentration programs. Most significant in this respect is Focal Point, which houses comprehensive information about all concentration programs.[10] From the home page, students and advisors can search the concentrations according to academic interests and potential career pathways. They can also explore individual programs in greater depth. With one click, users can see a short description of a particular program and its requirements, information about capstone and honors opportunities, and a bulleted list of the program's learning goals. Each concentration's page also explains the program's relevance to Brown's liberal learning goals. Alumni stories, which are now being added to Focal Point, describe the various career pathways that students pursue after graduation.

A necessary complement to Focal Point is our new online concentration declaration tool, (described in Part III: Assessment, Retention, and Student Success), and a new concentration

[7] https://ask.brown.edu/home/.
[8] By comparison, 57% of our first-years reported satisfaction with advising quality. Juniors and seniors reported 45% and 43% satisfaction, respectively. All percentages are from the 2007 Enrolled Student Survey.
[9] Among our juniors, 72% reported being satisfied with advising. 54% of seniors and 72% of first-years were generally or very satisfied. All percentages are from the 2011 Enrolled Student Survey.
[10] Focal Point can be accessed at http://www.brown.edu/academics/college/concentrations/.

advisor handbook that details best practices in concentration advising.[11] In addition to new online tools, we have expanded the accessibility of advising by holding open hours for advising in places where students congregate, such as the fitness center. The success of our focus on improved advising is borne out by a 2012 survey which showed that students' satisfaction with advising in the concentration has risen by a considerable degree: 78% of students report that they are satisfied or very satisfied with academic advising in the major, an increase of almost 20% above our 2008 satisfaction ratings.

Specialized Academic Support Resources

These and other improvements to our advising processes have directly benefited all students. At the same time, the College has dedicated considerable time and effort to strengthening academic resources for specific groups of students. To support our growing international student population, for example, the College created a new position, Coordinator of English as a Second Language Support Programs, and expanded International Orientation to include focused attention on writing and academic integrity. A series of workshops led by our ESL coordinator introduces students to academic writing in English and to the resources in the Writing Center and elsewhere that students can use to become successful students at Brown. A number of our international students also participate in Excellence at Brown, a pre-orientation program designed to introduce students to university expectations for classroom performance and writing. This program, which began four years ago with 20 students, has expanded to become an endowment-funded program supporting two hundred incoming students. A section especially for our international students has been added this year.

Our communications with international students have also been revamped to help them navigate their new learning environment. Currently enrolled international students helped us revise and expand our online and print publications for international students, including a new resource website that introduces students to the many people, offices, and support services available to international students.[12] A new series of emails, written in conjunction with our Office of International Students and Scholars Services, remind newly admitted students of the required timeline for obtaining immigration documents. Plans are currently being developed for an International Center, which will provide social and activity spaces while enhancing international students' ability to access the array of services they need to function effectively as students in the United States.

Our support for students interested in STEM disciplines has also greatly expanded. In 2009, the University repurposed one floor of our Science Library for a new Science Center, a space designed to integrate science advising, research, teaching, and outreach activities. Since its opening in February 2010, the Center has operated at or beyond capacity, with its six group study spaces and a larger configurable open space in constant use, particularly during evening hours. The larger central space is equipped with VGA inputs at multiple points that allow speakers to switch easily from traditional classroom lecture format ("sage on the stage") to providing more focused assistance to class breakout groups ("guide from the side"). Large, writeable surfaces allow for group work or lectures. Video screens on three walls allow participants to relax and eat

---

[11] The handbook can be viewed at https://ask.brown.edu/home/publicmaterials/viewfile/1.

[12] The new website is at http://brown.edu/campus-life/support/international-students/.

or take notes without having to strain to view a presentation. Library records show a significant increase in the number of users since the opening of the Center, particularly among faculty, whose library use had decreased when Brown's robust e-journal library came online.

One area of special interest supported by the Center is science communication. Brown has no formal program in science writing or science communication, but our students and faculty engage in a variety of science-related projects that rely on clear communication. The Science Center has taken a leading role in promoting these efforts, especially those that use emerging media to communicate scientific principles to a general audience. Among these initiatives are a mentoring project for Brown students interested in using art, animation, and videography to tell stories about science; a "Khan Academy"-style lesson plan to help students understand threshold concepts in organic chemistry; and a program to create animated podcasts that highlight intriguing concepts in neuroscience. In the coming years, study of science communication will also be strengthened by the presence of visiting professor Cornelia Dean, formerly the editor of the *New York Times* Science Times section.

The success of these and other activities has created a demand for even more space for collaborative science activities. The Center enjoys a 90-100% occupancy rate on Sunday through Thursday evenings. Many students who come to study in the Center must find other spaces to study collaboratively. Lack of space also limits our ability to host interdisciplinary science events that are popular with students, such as the "Science Trivia Showdown." Current discussions about repurposing library space include the possibility of expanding the Science Center into another floor of the building.

The opening of the Science Center coincided with our launching of a new website that contains comprehensive information on science advising, research opportunities, and science outreach activities at Brown.[13] The College also restructured a vacant position to hire a second dean with expertise in these areas. This dean has special responsibilities for coordinating the University's science outreach efforts, and to that end helped create a searchable database of all STEM outreach programs across the University. With this tool, students can find an existing group to join, locate faculty engaged in research of interest to them, or identify an unmet need that they might be able to fill. Faculty who need to incorporate Broader Impact components into grant proposals use the database to find existing outreach activities that might be suitable for their proposals.[14]

To spread the impact of Science Center activities across campus, a small cohort of undergraduate Science Fellows receives stipends in order to engage the larger community in science-related learning activities. Science Fellows have developed new ways to present scientific concepts, illuminate connections between science and the arts, or highlight Brown's collaborative approach to science education. Fellows are required to create some lasting impression of their work that can be shared with other students, faculty, or even people outside

---

[13] http://brown.edu/academics/science-center/.

[14] The database is organized according to three major categories: people, programs, and lesson plans. Search results can then be filtered by target audience, department, funding source, STEM area, activity type, grade level, and Rhode Island state standard. The database can be found at http://brown.edu/academics/science-center/outreach/outreach-database/stem-outreach-resource-source-database.

of Brown. Some Fellows must provide a final description of the project, accompanied by images if appropriate.[15]

The Science Center is also engaged in our efforts to support underrepresented students. A new Summer Bridge program called Catalyst introduces students to science professors, administrators, and labs in the natural and physical sciences, and provides intensive mentoring and academic support throughout the year. Funded by a grant from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Catalyst prepares incoming students for the rigors of a science concentration at Brown through collaboration with peers, continual engagement with problem solving, and the support of an entire community.

Other efforts to support underrepresented students are sponsored by our Associate Dean for Diversity Programs and Brown's Third World Center (a resource center for American minority and international students). An early advising initiative matches students with advisors who have a special interest in working with students from underrepresented groups. Another initiative called TEAM (for Team Enhanced Advising and Mentoring) helps faculty advisors learn about issues facing our neediest students. Faculty meet once a month in groups to discuss readings, listen to talks, and confer with professional staff – all in an effort to improve their advising. We began TEAM in 2009 with 10 faculty and increased that number to 25 in 2010. Our hope was to double our roster this year, and we exceeded that goal with 60 participating faculty. Our 2012 first-year student survey suggest that students in both advising cohorts are more satisfied with their advising than other students.

Career Advising

Following the 2008 economic crisis, many institutions of higher education saw the necessity of strengthening their career advising programs. At Brown, we implemented changes in personnel and programming that have improved our ability to support our current students' professional development needs. We hired a new director, created the position of Assistant Director for Employer Outreach, and reconfigured the position dedicated to pre-professional advising (combining advising for students considering medical, law, or business school).

The career center itself has been renamed the Center for Careers and Life After Brown, or CareerLAB, to reflect our holistic approach to advising students for meaningful professional pursuits and personal lives. The CareerLAB entryway, greeting area, and general meeting spaces were completely remodeled to provide a more welcoming environment for students and employers. All of these improvements, along with enhanced communications about events and recruiting opportunities, drew a record number of students to career-related events. For example, over 1,600 students attended our one-day Career Fair in October. The CareerLAB website has been completely rewritten to reflect our new focus, with expanded information on career fields and dedicated sites for pre-law, health careers, and a soon-to-be launched pre-business site.[16]

---

[15] Recent projects are summarized at http://brown.edu/academics/science-center/science-fellows/current-science-fellows.

[16] The CareerLAB website is at http://brown.edu/campus-life/support/careerlab/.

Our efforts to connect students with internships and with Brown alumni have grown accordingly. A new staff position was created to build Brown's capacity to match students with internship opportunities in the U.S. and abroad. New summer internship programs have been created in Boston and New York City, and an internships database allows students to share their internship experiences with the campus community. Opportunities for our students to network with Brown alumni have increased through two new programs co-sponsored by CareerLAB, academic departments, and the Office of Alumni Relations.

On Brown Degree Days, alumni meet with current students and discuss how their concentrations led to a variety of career paths. Brown Degree Days helps students learn firsthand how concentrations lead to real world opportunities. Another new initiative, January Career Laboratory, launched in 2012, brought more than 100 students to campus for three days just before the start of the spring term. The program includes interactive workshops, panels, and mentoring events, all run by Brown alumni in various career sectors.

Online Technology

In the time since NEASC last visited Brown, the University has implemented a number of online initiatives that complement our approach to liberal learning. Our efforts in this area began with a new system that allows faculty to upload their course syllabi during shopping period. On average, 60% of the faculty does this each semester.[17] But this result is clearly not sufficient, according to a recent survey of students in which online syllabi ranked as the most valuable online resource currently available at Brown. Students also indicated that Brown's new course management tool, Canvas, is superior to the Blackboard product still used by some faculty. In fact, students suggest that the best way to make syllabi available during shopping period is through Canvas course sites. We plan to work with faculty to significantly increase the availability of syllabi through Canvas. Blackboard will be sunsetted at Brown in summer 2013, after which Canvas will be the sole course management system supported by our IT staff.

Brown is also experimenting with various online technologies to foster student engagement in large lecture courses as well as other areas such as foreign language and math. Although Brown's faculty has expanded by 20% under the PAE, we still have more than 120 courses that enroll well over one hundred students.[18] These are often "service" or "gateway" courses into the concentrations that students take to "get out of the way." Such courses can be frustrating for faculty to teach, and we know that many students are not engaged by the large lecture format. Over the years, faculty in various departments have tried a range of online experiments to improve student learning and performance in courses both large and small. And in the languages, Brown has used technology successfully for quite some time. The real challenge is developing an infrastructure to support Brown's faculty in developing, testing, and evaluating the many online learning products currently on the market.

A new initiative in the Economics department is testing a technology-enabled approach to some of these issues. ECON 1110: Intermediate Microeconomics is a heavily enrolled course

[17] Brown's online syllabus bank can be found at courses.brown.edu.
[18] Most large courses are concentrated in Biology; Cognitive, Linguistic, and Psychological Sciences; Computer Science, Economics, and Engineering; the History of Art and Architecture; and Political Science.

that represents the main entry point into the discipline, both with its introduction of important concepts and its liberal use of calculus. Students often need considerable help to grasp the basic concepts and apply the math, yet only a few attend the weekly discussion sections conducted by teaching assistants. This fall, the department is piloting an alternate delivery method for one section of the course. In the new structure, 50-minute lecture periods have been converted into shorter "podcasts" with embedded quizzes that students complete online before class. Class meetings are devoted to group problem-solving activities. With more than one section of the course offered in the fall, Economics will be able to compare final exam results between classes. It will also track student retention of concepts in later, more advanced courses. The University plans to fund an initiative that will encourage similar revisions in other departments with large lecture courses.

Following the recommendations of an ad hoc Committee on Online Education chaired by the Dean of the College, the Provost authorized pilot projects to explore the possibilities of the online learning environment in two other categories. First, we have entered into an agreement with the online education company Coursera to offer a handful of courses free to the world at large. Three outstanding teacher-scholars are currently working with University staff to offer notable courses previously taught at Brown in a Massively Open Online Course format. Second, we have created a small set of wholly online for-credit summer courses for Brown students to explore the potential of the online environment within our undergraduate curriculum.

These and other online initiatives are designed to complement, not replace, the residential experience at Brown. A Brown education, after all, is about community. It depends on the presence – both intellectual and physical – of the professor and the students, in class as well as on campus. Some of the best learning at Brown takes place after class, during spontaneous conversations that ensue from what are often serendipitous meetings. Our consideration of online technologies reflects our understanding that Brown's Open Curriculum remains relevant so long as it continues to evolve with each new generation of students and faculty.

Federal Credit Hour

At Brown, decisions about the academic calendar are the purview of the faculty. During 2011-12, the faculty was broadly informed of the new federal credit hour definition in conjunction with a near-term need to resolve whether the academic calendar should be adjusted to accommodate a conflict between the start of the fall 2013 term and observance of Rosh Hashanah. These and other issues potentially affecting the calendar, including the credit hour standard, were first reviewed in the spring of 2011 by a faculty-administration working group established by the Provost. The working group concluded that it did not need to undertake a detailed study of the credit hour standard because Brown's class schedule appeared to be in overall conformity with the requirements.

Calendar questions were subsequently taken up by the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC). After reviewing the working group's report to the Provost, and following further consultation with the Registrar, the FEC convened a faculty forum on the subject of the academic calendar in December 2011, and in February 2012 the Rosh Hashanah question in particular was put to a vote at a full faculty meeting. During all these discussions, the credit hour standard was explicitly noted. The credit hour standard may also come into play in the course of strategic planning if new or amended course patterns are considered. If we determine that more detailed study of the credit hour question is necessary, it should wait until the University's new strategic plan has been formulated and approved.

Projection

While we will continue to forge ahead on the various fronts described above and in Part III: Assessment, Retention, and Student Success, the outcomes of our current campus strategic planning effort will inevitably have consequences for the continued development of the undergraduate curriculum. The President, Provost, and Dean of the College see it as critically important that we not be complacent about the virtues and attractiveness of the Open Curriculum. Armed with improved assessment mechanisms, alert to the evolving contexts of education, and mindful of national and global needs, we must continue to test the Open Curriculum's efficacy and innovate in response to new opportunities. The strategic planning discussions have already generated a number of ideas that will need to be developed and explored further. Whatever additional features or new directions emerge for the undergraduate curriculum, we will ideally have had a few years of experience with them by the time of our next ten-year report in 2018.

B. Graduate Program

Brown has made substantial investments in graduate education over the past five years, as discussed above in Special Emphasis Area 4: Strengthening the Graduate Program. Additionally, information about assessment of graduate education outcomes and near-term goals can be found below under Part III: Assessment, Retention, and Student Success. This part of the Standards narrative focuses on three developments: practices for evaluating graduate programs, support services for graduate students, and the growth in master's programs, including the launch of new executive master's programs.

Graduate Program Evaluation

The departmental review process (described under Standard 2: Planning, Evaluation, and Assessment) is ensuring that the Graduate Council, Graduate School administration, and department leadership have a regular mechanism for focusing intensively on the quality and structure of graduate programs on a cyclical basis. The graduate program reviews that have been completed to date have not called for any major changes. One departmental review carried out in 2011-12 pointed to the need for reexamining the current structure of doctoral requirements, and this will be a major topic of discussion in this year's review of the graduate program. The Graduate School collaborated with the Provost's office in 2010 to create a digital assessment archive and, on an annual basis, Graduate Council program assessment reports are uploaded to the electronic repository creating an accessible time series (see Appendix VII).

In other ways, too, the culture of graduate program evaluation continues to grow more robust. Many of Brown's PhD programs received quite favorable ranking ranges in the 2010

NRC Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs.[19] But the chief value of the NRC study for us is twofold: first, it furnishes a wealth of data on both our own programs and those at peer institutions; second, the study provides a set of benchmarks since the results are based on 2005 data and do not reflect the significant investments made since that time through the PAE. Since the Assessment's release, the Graduate School has engaged in numerous conversations with department chairs and faculty about the best ways to understand and use the NRC data and categories for graduate program planning. As already discussed above, the data and analytic environment for such efforts is now richer following Brown's agreement to participate in Academic Analytics.

Graduate Student Services

The Graduate School administration meets regularly with Graduate Student Council officers and seeks input on initiatives. Some specific near-term goals include: aligning student services with the needs of a growing master's population, and supporting efforts to increase graduate alumni engagement and representation.

Continued improvement in the learning, teaching, and living spaces available to graduate students remains an important goal. The University has commissioned architectural plans to increase graduate student spaces in libraries. With the conversion from print to electronic format complete for essentially all science journals, large portions of the Science Library are being refurbished, and as space becomes accessible, additional areas are being made available to graduate students. The University is also in the midst of reviewing proposals from local developers to offer housing for graduate students. The aim is to better understand the potential for small/concentrated off-campus dedicated housing and to test whether such housing fosters a greater sense of community.

With respect to life after graduate school, we are working to improve collection and maintenance of student outcome data, which will in turn help direct the kinds of career support we provide for students. The University hosts LinkedIn groups that foster stronger connections between current graduate students and alumni. Our graduate students have free access to Virtual PhD, an online subscription-based resource providing peer and professional support for exploring a broad range of career options. Brown's CareerLAB helps graduate students prepare for job possibilities beyond academia through targeted program offerings, such as a 2012 workshop on science career pathways led by a national expert.

The Graduate School has also invested in improved systems to manage the numerous and complex academic, operational, planning, and reporting processes it oversees. The Graduate Student Information Management (GSIM) system, created in 2008, has provided the Graduate School with the ability to track the standing and progress of current students as well as funding commitments and significant student events. Since its implementation, the Graduate School has more recently been working with the University's Computing and Information Services on a

---

[19] Out of 34 Brown doctoral programs included in the study, 22 programs had 5th percentile S-Rankings in the top 20% of programs in their discipline. Using the midpoint instead, nine programs were in the top 20%. S-rankings derive from survey data of disciplinary faculty on the normative components of perceived quality. The data for the study were collected in 2005-06.

multi-year project to make the appointment process paperless for the University's 1,300 doctoral students.

Graduate education is a significant area of focus in this year's strategic planning process, and a special committee is evaluating the most pressing needs and promising opportunities for doctoral programs and students. A separate committee on master's education will likely be convened in the spring. While it is too early to say what specific actions will be called for or what goals will be set, key considerations will include continued growth of the Graduate School, commensurate with recent and future faculty growth, and continued enhancement of professional development opportunities.

Master's and Executive Master's Programs

Master's programs have been on the rise at Brown for some time and in 2011 incoming master's students outnumbered the new PhD students for the first time. We expect this trend to continue as departments are encouraged to consider the educational and financial benefits of offering new or revitalized master's programs. Growth of master's programs is an important part of the plan for building up the scale and scope of the School of Engineering.

Brown is also in the process of launching a new category of master's degree. In May 2012, the Corporation approved an Executive Master of Healthcare Leadership, which will be stewarded by the Office of Continuing Education in partnership with the Provost's office and the Public Health Program. Over the next several years, we expect to develop a number of other executive master's programs. Our vision for Brown is to create a separate and distinct category of such degrees that do not compete with existing on-campus Brown master's degree programs. The chief distinguishing feature of the executive master's programs is that they will be aimed at working adults (with different educational goals) from those who are attracted to the current master's degree offerings. The format of instruction also will differ. Adult learners will come to campus periodically for intensive sessions with their cohort and, in between those times, study via on-line modules that are delivered by highly qualified instructors. Campus classroom resources will be used only during hours they are not otherwise in demand (evenings, weekends, intersessions).

In some cases, regular Brown faculty may have interests in program development or instruction, but those connections are not considered necessary for creating viable programs. What is considered necessary is a Brown academic leader who can guarantee the quality and integrity of the curriculum and provide oversight of the instructional staff. All courses and instructors are being approved through Brown faculty committees and procedures, either the existing ones on campus, or new ones tailored to the new mission and approved by the Brown faculty. In the case of Healthcare Leadership, senior faculty in Public Health are serving as program advisors and we have established a distinguished external advisory panel.

The cohort-based program model we have selected for these new executive master's programs anticipates sequential course offerings of several months duration, so that after four continuous semesters (16 months), students will have completed the eight courses required for a Brown master's degree. It is expected that the cohort will meet as a group on campus at the start and finish of the program, and in addition, at some or all of the transitions from one course period to the next. In this way, every course will include at least one period of intensive face-to-face instruction. The proportion of online to face-to-face instruction is expected to average about 70:30 across the curriculum. The on-line portion of instruction will be supported by Canvas, the same Learning Management System that is deployed for regular on-campus courses. However, course module instructional design and support will be much more extensive due to the greater amount of material to be covered on line compared to on-campus courses. The investments needed to launch and sustain the initiative are coming from reserves accumulated in the Office of Continuing Education.

Applications for the Executive Master's in Healthcare Leadership began to be accepted in September 2012. We plan to fill the first cohort of students during spring 2013, and enroll them during summer 2013. Through communication with NEASC during the fall of 2011, we reached the understanding that given the blended delivery format, with none of the course credits to be earned entirely online, these Executive Master's degrees do not represent a substantive change requiring separate reporting. Nonetheless, these programs are a departure for Brown and will be monitored and reviewed with care. In fact, the faculty vote approving the Healthcare Leadership program was contingent on a full review of the program after three years.

5. FACULTY

In the years since our 2009 NEASC evaluation, Brown has continued to increase the faculty ranks and to ensure that faculty have the resources they need to achieve excellence in research and teaching. Notwithstanding the end of the period of rapid increase brought about by the PAE, we have continued to authorize searches and make appointments in areas of curricular and scholarly need: the number of regular faculty has grown from 689 in 2008-09 to 712 for academic year 2012-13.

Successful recruitment efforts suggest that we are able to make competitive offers in terms of salary, start-up, and research support. Over the last three years, we have realized an average yield of 69% on hires from searches in all ranks. As we have turned our attention increasingly to junior level hires, we continue to have significant success in that area, with an average yield of about 80%. For searches defined at the associate/full or full professor ranks, for which hiring is more difficult, our average yield over this period has been 61%. While these are encouraging results, we nevertheless continue to monitor salary data carefully, to ensure that Brown does not fall behind its peers.

As already discussed in Special Emphasis Area 2: Tenure Policies and Practices, we have implemented a number of changes to the procedures for annual reviews of junior faculty and for the tenure review, which are intended to enhance faculty development and to ensure that Brown's faculty continue to be excellent teachers and scholars.

We also continue to discuss how best to support faculty development. The 2008 sabbatical policy, which provides for more frequent leaves, has now been fully phased in. A preliminary analysis suggests that, since the policy was introduced, the average number of faculty on sabbatical in any given year has increased by nearly 10%. Consistent with our high expectations for faculty, the Dean of the Faculty is also evaluating the structure of leaves, with particular focus on providing stronger encouragement for newly-tenured faculty to bring new projects to fruition soon after promotion. To that end, we are considering introducing a semester of paid leave to faculty in the year following promotion to Associate Professor. The Dean of the Faculty is also working to clarify the functions and responsibilities of our non-tenure-track faculty – lecturers and senior lecturers, appointed on multi-year contracts – within departments and in relation to regular faculty, along with the kinds of professional development opportunities that are most appropriate.

We have placed increasing emphasis on mentoring junior faculty. In 2006, under the auspices of a five-year NSF ADVANCE grant, Brown started a program that paired new tenure-track faculty with senior faculty mentors from different departments. With the end of the ADVANCE grant, the Provost, Dean of the Faculty, and Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences are supporting an enhanced faculty mentoring program. In addition to continuing support for one-on-one mentoring, the program now also includes various events for mentors and mentees throughout the year covering a variety of topics, including the work-life balance, the teaching-research-service balance, proposal writing, and supervising student theses.

While the faculty expansion under the PAE is fully sustainable, fundraising for endowed professorships remains an important priority. Although the last capital campaign exceeded its overall target, it fell short of expectations for faculty chairs. Funding for faculty positions and scholarly support will continue to be a significant emphasis in future fundraising efforts. The Provost has already directed a set of existing and new discretionary gift funds toward strengthening scholarly infrastructure. Over the last year, this effort has included the purchase of major new scientific instrumentation that can be used by several research groups and creation of a facility for the production of works on paper in the visual arts. Further investments of this kind can be expected over the next several years.

Although faculty growth in the coming years will be more modest than under the PAE, the strategic planning process now underway is expected to result in the identification of priority areas for additional investment (see Part IV: Plans). Already, however, faculty growth is taking place in selected areas: in the recently established School of Engineering; in the soon-to-be inaugurated School of Public Health (which recently attracted a group of researchers in evidence-based medicine from another university); in the humanities, with the specific goal of promoting collaborative modes of humanist inquiry; and in connection with the Brown Institute for Brain Science. These areas of focus and others (for example, environmental science) have placed a strong emphasis on cross-disciplinary scholarship that involves many parts of the campus. The challenge, especially during the current planning phase, will be to use the various measurement tools at our disposal, along with qualitative data, to gauge the nature and degree of presumed improvement that would accompany investments in additional faculty and scholarly support structures.

6. STUDENTS

A. College Admissions and Financial Aid

Since 2009, applications for admission to Brown have risen to historic highs and admission rates have fallen to historic lows, with the current first-year class facing an admit rate of just over 9% for the 1,600 spaces in the entering class. Included in the unprecedented applicant pools of the past four years are record numbers of international students, students of color, students interested in pursuing the physical sciences, and first generation college applicants – all groups targeted by the Admission Office in its outreach and recruiting efforts.

The changing face of the Brown applicant pool is reflected in the composition of this year's entering class. The Class of 2016 includes historically high numbers of African American, Latino(a), and Native American students; 37% of the class identify as minority students, the largest percentage in the College's history. The Class of 2016 also equals or surpasses previous first-year classes in other respects: 14% are the first in their families to attend college, 12% hold international passports, and more than 50% intend to concentrate in the life or physical sciences.

The College continues to seek a distinguished and diverse student body from all parts of the nation and the world, and with the assistance of Brown's expanded aid programs the Admission Office has tried to be creative and thoughtful in broadening its outreach and recruitment efforts. In 2010, for example, Brown joined 15 other highly selective institutions as members of the QuestBridge consortium, a non-profit, California-based organization that provides member schools with access to thousands of talented first generation college-bound students, many of whom are also students of color. Brown's participation in the QuestBridge program, along with targeted recruiting by admission officers, has enabled the College to increase the number of African American students in the entering class from 96 for the Class of 2013 to 149 for the Class of 2016, a 55% increase in four years. Brown has also expanded its consortial recruitment activities with peer schools, and the resulting "joint travel" programs have brought increased visibility – nationally and abroad – to Brown's culture, programs, and philosophy.

The past four years have seen incoming classes with outstanding academic credentials (as measured by standardized testing and advanced course-work) as well as significant extracurricular and personal accomplishments. The positive results of those recruitment/selection/matriculation efforts are evident in our students' success in major fellowship programs, and the high degree of graduate school and career placement successes experienced by recent graduating classes.

Record applicant pools and vast numbers of talented applicants have strained the capacity of the Admission Office to adhere to Brown's traditional, very personal evaluation process which requires that each file be read by two members of the admission staff. While there are temptations to abandon the current system in the face of massive applicant pools, the Admission Office has persisted in reviewing each applicant several times in order to ensure that candidates are afforded as much scrutiny and opportunity as each deserves. Since 2011, the Admissions Office has been aided greatly in its work by an online indexing and reading system which eliminated the need to print, collate, and file more than 30,000 applications comprised of nearly one million pieces of paper.

In our 2008 self-study, we reported on the many significant changes in financial aid policies that had recently been implemented. These included introducing need-blind admission; eliminating loans for students whose family income is below $100,000 and reducing loans in all other income categories; eliminating family contributions from most students whose families earn below $60,000; and increasing aid for transfer students, Resumed Undergraduate Education (RUE) students, and international students. With these new policies in place, University need-based awards grew to $69.5 million in 2008-09. University financial aid has continued to increase since then, and we project spending $90.1 million on institutional aid in 2012-13.

Currently, the University provides financial aid to 43% of our undergraduates, our highest level ever. Financial Aid staff work closely with an even larger number of undergraduates (57%) during their time at Brown through processing financial assistance provided from outside scholarships, federal grants, federal loans, parent loans, Yellow Ribbon, and other sources. Improvements similar to those being made in our financial aid program are also occurring at the institutions with which we compete. Many have adopted need-blind admission for international students. Although Brown does not currently offer need-blind admission for international students, transfers, or students in our Resumed Undergraduate Education (RUE) program, we have invested significant incremental funds in international student aid. The amount of financial aid provided to international students has increased from $3.8 million in academic year 2007-08 to $8.4 million in 2011-12, and the percentage of aided international students also increased by 84%. Some campus groups have also begun to lobby for increasing the aid awarded to transfer and RUE students.

Students connected with the military are another group that has been the focus of new attention. In the area of financial aid, following President Obama's April 2012 Executive Order Establishing Principles of Excellence for Educational Institutions Serving Service Members, Veterans, Spouses, and Other Family Members, we have written to the Veterans Administration to indicate that Brown fully supports the goal of providing clear, timely and accurate information to all of our students, including service members and veterans, so that they can make informed decisions about their education. While our policies and practices are entirely consistent with the spirit of the Principles, the requirement that Universities provide educational plans to students and to students' branch of service before they complete more than one class would depart from Brown's expectation that students explore the curriculum in their first two years of study. Instead of a front-ended educational plan, our extensive and multi-layered system of faculty, academic, and peer advising provides close guidance to each student during the early years of their programs before they pursue the focused requirements of their concentrations.

Ensuring that the University's financial aid awards are competitive will continue to be a challenge for Brown in the years ahead. The Office of Financial Aid continues to look for ways to align the University's financial aid packaging policies more closely with the needs of students and their families. The amount and extent of the University's provision for financial aid is an area of focus in the strategic planning process, and in 2018 we will be able to report on the outcomes of the policy decisions that will result.

B. Student Services

There has been a lot of progress on Campus Life initiatives that were mentioned in Brown's 2008 self-study and in the accreditation team's 2009 report. One of the most significant areas identified for improvement was the undergraduate residential experience. We had indicated that we were planning improvements to programming and resources for students in residence, and the NEASC team identified the need for building renovations. Currently, Brown is undertaking a $69 million renovation effort for residence halls, which will be coupled with significant programming and staffing efforts in collaboration with the Office of the Dean of the College. When completed, we expect these projects to fulfill many of the goals identified for residential life in our 2008 self-study, particularly those focused on the living and learning environment, community building, and adequacy of systems, as well as making progress on the type of accommodations available to juniors and seniors.

Renovation projects begun in the summer of 2012 will transform the undergraduate residential experience in ways that complement our Open Curriculum. Through significant renovation over the next year and a half, Keeney Quad and the Pembroke campus will become first-year communities incorporating generous amounts of study, teaching, programming, and social space along with advising and faculty resources. This work will enable the designation of intentional sophomore housing close to the core of campus that can support the academic goals of the sophomore year. Other renovations will result in more suites, apartments, and single rooms for juniors and seniors. Beyond these improvements, we are planning a second phase of fundraising for a new residence hall of suites and apartments for juniors and seniors. A new residence hall would increase our capacity for on-campus housing and would also allow us to take buildings off-line to keep up with major on-going renovation and repair. We expect to report on the results of these changes in 2018.

When the NEASC team visited in 2009, the Stephen Robert '62 Campus Center renovation was in process. Since its opening in 2011, the Campus Center has had an important positive impact on students, staff, faculty, alumni, and visitors. Admissions and Campus Life collaboratively staff a welcome desk, which now functions as Brown's front door for visitors and for everyone on campus. Graduate and undergraduate students make daily and constant use of the Center's meeting, study, and eating spaces. As the NEASC team recommended, the Campus Center includes space for graduate students. We are exploring additional ways to support the graduate student community, including dedicated graduate student housing.

Other important projects in Campus Life include reconceiving the Faculty Advising Fellows (FAF) program so that it involves more faculty members and reaches many more students. Working with the Dean of the College's office, Campus Life has shifted the program away from a faculty house-based model to one in which faculty fellows work together to support student learning outside the classroom. Each fellow serves a three-year term and is assigned a dozen or so advisees – a combination of first-year, sophomore, and transfer students. The events planned and hosted by faculty fellows are geared to student interests and target particular class years. First-year students attend such events as Getting the Most out of Lecture Courses, Stress Management, and How to Read a BIG Book. Sophomore events include Letters of Recommendation, Beyond the Classroom, and Demanding Concentrations. A luncheon series under the rubric "The Writer's Life" brings students together with prominent authors to discuss writing. This year's writers include Charles Rappleye, author of our First Readings selection; and

Cornelia Dean, a visiting professor who is a senior science writer for the *New York Times*. This past year, two faculty became the leaders of the FAF program, which ensures continued faculty engagement with the program and increased satisfaction among participating faculty and students alike.

We have also sought to improve Psychological Services, where the NEASC team recommended more staff resources. Hiring an additional psychotherapist has enabled us to increase the number of appointments we can offer students on campus.

This year, the Campus Life and Dean of the College offices have improved support for international students, for student veterans, and for those enrolled in ROTC programs. An enhanced orientation program for international students commences several days prior to the main first-year orientation and focuses on opportunities to connect with, and learn from, other international students and peer mentors. A new website has also been created to explain the programs and services we offer to international students.[20] The Office of the Provost, the College, the Graduate School, Student Services, and other offices are working on a plan to create an International Center that would serve as a "home base" for international students. The idea is to improve coordination of services for this growing population at Brown by housing representatives of each student service office in one location. Co-curricular programming would be provided for all international members of the campus community.

Following an in-depth review of the position of ROTC at Brown in 2011 by a committee of faculty and students chaired by the Dean of the College, we established an office in J. Walter Wilson (the central locus for student services and advising) as well as a portal on our website for Student Veterans and Commissioning Programs as part of an institutional effort to expand our resources for students associated with the military.[21] We are enhancing support for our students who participate in ROTC at Providence College and are exploring the addition of Naval ROTC as a joint program with the University of Rhode Island.

An extensive review of varsity athletics conducted in 2011 resulted in a strengthened focus on academic priorities while also addressing important facility needs and salary equity for athletics staff. Fundraising is underway to provide more competitive levels of support for Brown's 37 varsity teams. The opening of the Nelson Fitness Center, Zucconi Strength and Conditioning Center, Garonzik Fitness Loft, and the Katherine Coleman Moran Aquatics Center has significantly improved Brown's fitness and recreation facilities. At the same time, they have allowed us to offer academic advising on the side of campus where student-athletes spend a majority of their time. We expect that, under the leadership of new Athletic Director Jack Hayes, we will continue to improve the student athlete experience at Brown.

Vice President for Campus Life Margaret Klawunn was recently also designated a Senior Associate Dean of the College reporting to Dean of the College Katherine Bergeron. This new reporting relationship will further encourage the integration of academic and co-curricular efforts

---

[20] http://brown.edu/campus-life/support/international-students/.

[21] The report on ROTC and President Simmons's response are available at: http://brown.edu/reports/rotc/. The web portal for students related to the military is at: http://www.brown.edu/campus-life/support/veterans-and-commissioning-programs/student-veteran-portal.

to better support the undergraduate experience. The NEASC team lauded the Campus Life strategic indicators report which assesses our progress toward university goals. We have kept up our assessment work and will continue to do so in support of the goals for the Division of Campus Life that emerge from the current strategic planning exercise.

7. LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

A. Library

Since 2009, the Library has made significant changes to its organization and personnel composition. In the wake of the financial crisis, key steps including the campus-wide organizational review, the early retirement program, and the cross-unit transfers between Computing and Information Services (CIS) and the Library have helped produce more effective and cohesive services. Staff reductions (14) and early retirements (20) enabled the Library to redesign and reallocate positions to meet emerging needs of the 21st-century research library and its users. Twenty-nine percent of all Library staff are new to their positions since 2009, and for the first time in over a decade the average tenure of professional Library staff at Brown is below 20 years.

These and other changes over the past several years have enabled the Library to develop and manage a more dynamic set of collections and services critical to today's students and faculty. In our self-study, we noted the need for an internal assessment process to identify necessary skills and appropriate training opportunities for staff to meet the new requirements of library service. Since that time, we have reviewed and revised all position descriptions and have also systematically asked Library department heads to provide feedback on their staffing needs as well as annual reports on their goals and accomplishments.

While the Library continues to support traditional methods of scholarship, it has made great strides in promoting digital scholarship and digital literacies across campus, specifically embodied in the work of the Center for Digital Scholarship (CDS). Through lecture series, faculty-student collaborative initiatives, grant-funded projects, and other efforts, CDS serves as a focal point of expertise at Brown for digital humanities and the development and application of general digital library methods and tools. Brown's contribution in these areas extends beyond campus into the national and international arenas. The Library has joined both the Digital Library Federation and the National Digital Stewardship Alliance and was invited to become a contributing member of the Digital Library of the Caribbean – providing a valuable alliance with the University's Haitian Studies Initiative and the work of Brown's Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, the Africana Studies Department, and the newly created Center for the Study of Slavery and Justice.

As the NEASC visiting team wrote, instruction in the use of contemporary research library materials and technology "is especially important for students who are the first in their family to attend college, students who attended inner-city or rural schools, and students who have had minimal training in research skills." The Library now collaborates with the College on two programs that support first generation college students and other students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The Excellence at Brown pre-orientation program focuses on incoming students who need extra help acclimating to Brown's academic culture. Excellence students come to campus a week early to participate in a five-day intensive writing program that includes a library component. The second program, funded by a Sidney Frank endowment, provides special advising and financial aid to first-generation college students whose families are least likely to be able to afford a Brown education. Students receive a structured introduction from Library staff to 21^{st}-century research resources and skills.

As the Library endeavors to make the right content available in the right format at the right time, it has taken deliberate steps to determine which publications are most needed and to allocate its limited financial resources accordingly – gradually moving toward a "just in time" instead of "just in case" plan for collection access. Foremost among these steps was the Library's consultation with faculty to identify journal subscriptions across the disciplines for cancellation. In 2008-09 a total of 1,450 titles were cancelled, with subsequent reallocation of $255,000. In 2009-10 and 2010-11, another 2,000 titles were cancelled, which realized a budget reduction of $400,000. In addition, the Library has initiated several "purchase on demand" arrangements with publishers and continues to explore other methods that encourage user input regarding access or acquisition at the point of need. Beyond its local offerings, the Library provides access to many millions of volumes through Borrow Direct partners (expanded in the past year with the addition of Harvard and MIT libraries), the HELIN (InRhode) consortium, and traditional interlibrary loan services, and is involved in several consortia that help leverage purchasing power. Responding to user preferences, the Library continues to make access to digital content a priority; in 2010-11, 68% of Library acquisitions expenditures were for electronic resources.

A major planning initiative during 2011-12 focused on formulating strategic directions for the future growth and management of Library collections. Key to the Library's ability to provide access to the most needed resources is adequate financial support. The NEASC visiting team expressed concern in their report regarding "reductions in support from the University if endowment income increases beyond a certain level, which if not corrected may be an additional obstacle to balancing scholars' needs across the University." Attempting to help alleviate this situation on a case-by-case basis, the Provost approved a newly established collections endowment in Engineering (a priority growth area for the University) that would be added to the Library's base budget rather than treated as budget relief.

As discussed in our 2008 self-study, "the coming decade will see sustained and innovative methodologies employed to make [the Library's special collections] available both to the Brown community and to the scholarly community at large." Continued notable progress has been achieved in making Brown's rich holdings of rare and special materials more accessible and integrating their use into the academic experience more broadly. Three grants, totaling more than $500,000, have been awarded to help organize and describe significant special collections (including support for hiring two project archivists). Also, the newly hired Director of Special Collections and the John Hay Library is focusing efforts on increasing the accessibility and visibility of special collections.

The visiting team noted the priority that undergraduate and graduate students place on quality spaces within the Library. With significant funding secured from external sources, the Library has continued to pursue its phased approach to upgrading the physical facilities with notable success. Recent projects include: opening the Walter L.S. Bopp '35 Seminar Room in the John Hay Library; creating the Laura and David Finn P'70, P'76, P'77 Reading Room on the first floor of the Rockefeller Library; renovating the undergraduate and graduate computer clusters and study spaces on the second floor of the Rockefeller Library; renovating and opening a new study space on the fourth floor of Sciences Library (adding 96 new seats for users); creating an Art Study Area on Level A of the Rockefeller Library; and opening the Champlin Memorial Library in the new Medical Education Building of the Alpert Medical School. The Library also collaborated with the Dean of the College, the Division of Biology and Medicine, and others to establish the Science Center on the third floor of the Sciences Library, and the Library collaborated with colleagues in Art History to close the Art Slide Library in the List Arts Building and relocate these staff and services within the Rockefeller Library. In 2011, the University completed a major Library space planning study that focused on recommendations for the future utilization of space in the Rockefeller, Sciences, and John Hay Libraries. Implementation of these recommendations began with the opening of the new Patrick Ma Digital Scholarship Lab in the Rockefeller Library in October.

Over the next five years, the Library will be involved in a number of key campus-based initiatives that align with the changing landscape of research, teaching, and learning at Brown. Among these are the collaboration with CIS staff to assist faculty with adapting their courses to Canvas, Brown's newly implemented course management system; enhanced integration of Library services and content within Canvas, including a review and replacement of the current online course reserve system; working with others to launch VIVO, which presents scholarly information on faculty and their research activities; and working with offices and individuals across campus to implement records management procedures. Additionally, through the Digital Scholarship Lab, the Library will enhance research and teaching across the disciplines by supporting the exploration and understanding of data through visualization and other technologies. There are also preliminary plans for revised use of library spaces in both the Rockefeller and Sciences libraries to create new centers for learning and student-faculty collaboration.

The Library recently revised its website based on user feedback and implemented a new Google-like discovery tool that allows users to search simultaneously across many of the Library's collections, databases, and resources (increasing Library Web traffic by more than 50%). The Library has also developed specialized applications enabling mobile access to its website and many online resources, and actively uses blogs, wikis, and other instructional technology to further the educational mission of Brown.

Several other newly defined services have been developed since the NEASC report, including: implementing the Brown Digital Repository to preserve locally digitized materials and Brown's scholarly output; assisting faculty in developing scientific data management plans for government-funded grants; working with faculty to develop digital projects that enhance and often help blend teaching and research interests; and providing advice on copyright, fair use, and NIH public access policy compliance. In 2012, the Provost charged a committee co-chaired by the University Librarian and Vice President for Research to evaluate Open Access publication policies and make recommendations for Brown's administration and faculty to consider. The Library continues to extend the range of support it offers for digital scholarship. Newly hired staff are available to assist Brown faculty and students with data curation services, digital humanities projects, digital preservation, new modes of scholarly communication, e-publication, and the creative use of mobile technologies. Likewise, the Library is committed to working with others across the campus and beyond as Brown enriches its teaching and learning experiences in the realm of online education.

B. Information Resources

With the implementation of Brown's 2008 IT Strategic Plan, the University's information technology infrastructure, support, and services have seen substantial improvements. Essential to making these changes sustainable are a newly implemented IT governance framework and an IT cost and funding model initiative that is still a work in progress. These two elements were informed by a 2010 IT Risk Audit and a 2011 externally-facilitated IT capital planning assessment.

The 2008 IT Strategic Plan was updated in late 2010 to provide a roadmap through 2013.[22] In preparing the updated plan, the campus-wide committee considered the NEASC accreditation report, PAE progress, the financial climate, and the rise of mobile and cloud computing. Brown has taken an early adopter strategy with cloud computing and in doing so has reduced costs and risks. Major new cloud-based systems implementations include Canvas Course Management, Workday HR/Payroll and Benefits, and Google Apps for Education. We upgraded our network and telecommunications systems to provide Internet2 connectivity, a redundant internet connection, VOIP, and expanded wireless access. In the area of network security we have changed our approach to allocating IP address space and redesigned the network infrastructure to segment core systems and services from Internet facing services creating a DMZ.

Our academic support capabilities were improved by creating an Educational Technology Center for faculty and a multimedia lab in the new Granoff Center for the Creative Arts; adding a new learning management system, Canvas; and continuing to make improvements in classroom technology, including automated lecture capture, video teleconferencing, live streaming, multiple distribution channels, and loaner media production equipment. To support research, we created condo and time sharing models of high performance computing. To support the enterprise, in addition to our cloud solutions, we installed a Professional Development System and a new Budget and Financial Management Tool, while also redesigning the Brown web to support mobile devices. In the area of security, we implemented a firewall redesign with DMZ and Shibboleth federated identity, and tools for PII detection and laptop encryption. We also implemented a complete IT disaster recovery plan and completed over a hundred departmental business continuity plans.

In addition to the new IT governance process designed to facilitate input from academic leadership in IT investment decisions, the Provost has established a community technology consortium, and expanded the training resources and availability of IT support. Information

[22] http://www.brown.edu/cis/about/it-strategic-plan/reports/brown-university-it-strategic-plan-20101123update.pdf.

technology plans over the next few years involve a continued strategy to pursue cloud offerings where appropriate. Key enterprise system replacements will remain a focus with the most significant plans supporting additional Workday modules, most notably Workday Financials, to replace the aged general ledger and purchasing software. Other application plans include VIVO (described above), Blackbaud's eCRM (customer relationship management system) to replace our current advancement and fundraising application, and an upgrade of our research and grant accounting applications from Coeus to the Kuali Coeus software.

Additional datacenter renovations will provide expanded capacity to meet growing high-performance computing demands. Network upgrades and refreshments will target academic technology, research support, and growing wireless and mobile demands as well as expanded support of federated identity management, which will allow colleagues outside the Brown community to participate in scholarship, research, and learning. The development of strategic planning goals involving online education and faculty resources will also help determine and structure IT priorities over the next five years.

8. PHYSICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The NEASC evaluation team made several recommendations with regard to Brown's physical and technological resources, and we have made significant progress in addressing them along with other needs and priorities identified through ongoing campus processes. By the end of five years from the last visit, we will have invested another $500 million to expand our facilities pursuant to the goals of the PAE.

We greatly improved the student experience by renovating Faunce House to create the Stephen Robert '62 Campus Center, and have just opened a new athletic center with a 56-meter pool and extensive fitness facilities. The Fitness Center is Rhode Island's first hybrid (heat and power) solar installation, as well as the largest in the nation and the first on a college campus. We are in the process of renovating a number of residence halls, upgrading our classrooms, and installing new technology. We have opened the new Granoff Center for the Creative Arts, and completely renovated facilities for the Department of Cognitive, Linguistic, and Psychological Sciences and for the Alpert Medical School. A complete renovation of the Brown Environmental Research and Teaching Building is underway to provide expanded research space for environmental studies and Engineering. The University's strategic planning process includes a committee on reimagining the Brown campus and community which will make recommendations for priorities going forward.

Student Housing and Athletic Facilities

The NEASC evaluation team found that Brown's physical and technological resources are sufficient and appropriate for achieving its mission, and that the exteriors and the grounds are well maintained. Yet, while Brown has made significant progress on campus through major building renovation projects of academic, student services, and administrative buildings, the team noted that there had been little renewal work for student housing and athletic facilities. Since then, Brown has made major investments in both housing and athletics. When this work is completed in the next few years, these facilities will be at least on a par with the generally good or excellent condition of our academic, student services, and administrative buildings.

Starting in 2010, Brown embarked on an ambitious $69 million program to transform the undergraduate living experience at Brown. Significant renovations have been made to a number of residential buildings, including 315 Thayer Street; Miller, Metcalf, and Andrews Halls; Keeney Quad; Wayland Hall; Emery-Woolley; Morriss-Champlin; Hope College; and Hegeman Hall. Summer 2012 renovations added 94 new beds which, when added to the recently renovated 1,090 beds, account for almost 25% of Brown's housing stock. (For the programmatic dimension of these residential life renovations, see Standard 6: Students.)

Brown has also made significant investments in its athletic facilities over the past several years. In addition to the new Aquatics and Fitness Center and Strength and Conditioning Center noted above, there have been multiple renewal projects including new roofs at the Pizzitola Sports Center and Meehan Auditorium buildings; construction of new soccer and field-hockey fields; extensive drainage system upgrades throughout the athletic fields; and replacement of the track in the Olney-Margolies Athletic Center field house. The total expenditure on these projects will be in excess of $64 million.

Facility Renewal Funding and Assessment

These topics are discussed under Special Emphasis Area 3: Research Infrastructure Support.

Energy and Environmental Initiatives

Brown's 2008 self-study indicated that, with regard to the energy conservation fund, $2 million had been expended, and another $8 million of expenditures had been authorized. To date, $12 million has been spent on energy conservation projects, and a total of $28 million has been authorized. By the end of 2010-11, Brown had reduced its energy-related carbon footprint by 26% below 2007 levels as part of an ambitious greenhouse gas reduction plan. This 26% reduction put us significantly ahead of the 16% reduction goal laid out in the original plan for this time period. We are well on our way to achieving our ultimate goal of reducing our energy-related carbon footprint by 42% below 2007 levels by 2020. Brown continues to be a national leader in this aspect of campus sustainability.

At the end of the 2011-12 academic year, a group of undergraduate students submitted a proposal for Brown to develop a sustainability strategic plan. After consideration by the President and Provost, the proposal was approved, and a campus committee has been formed to develop the plan this year. We expect to formulate a set of goals extending well beyond emissions reduction to include water consumption and runoff, waste and recycling, food waste reduction, integration of academic activities with university operations, community coordination and outreach, reporting, fundraising, and evaluation.

Governance

The evaluation team observed that the Corporation was less involved in monitoring the overall condition of the campus compared to its participation in architect selection for major construction projects. The Sightlines overall facilities assessment study (discussed in Special Emphasis Area 3: Research Infrastructure and Support) served as an opportunity to engage the Corporation more fully in this critical area. The Corporation Committee for Facilities and Design discussed the Sightlines assessment process in February 2010, and again the following May at the completion of the study. A summary of the report was also made to the full Corporation by the Facilities and Design committee chair in October of 2010. In addition to simply quantifying the facility needs over the next 10 years, Sightlines provided a series of planning tools, such as the creation of building portfolios, Net Asset Value calculations, and project selection tools that staff now use as part of regular reports to the Corporation committee.

The Capital Project Report, which previously had been distributed only to the Corporation Committee on Facilities and Design, has been regularly distributed to the full Corporation since October 2010 (see Appendix VIII). The report provides a snapshot of the progress being made on all major projects and planning efforts. These changes provide greater opportunity for Corporation Committee members to develop a portfolio perspective on campus buildings and to build their awareness of approaching critical renewal needs.

Classroom Technology

In 2007, Brown embarked on a program of classroom renovations that includes audio visual (AV) upgrades, and the NEASC evaluation team noted that new classrooms and seminar rooms appeared to be very well equipped. To date, 58 classrooms have received AV upgrades, at a cost of $1.4 million. In addition, new state-of-the-art classrooms have been constructed as part of recent projects including the Lyman Hall renovation, Rhode Island Hall renovation, Medical Education Building, and the Metcalf Center renovation. Ongoing upgrades of classroom technology will occur as part of major renovation projects, such as the Brown Environmental Research and Teaching Building project now underway.

The NEASC committee recommended that Brown develop a plan for regular classroom technology renewal and attempt to appropriate funds for this purpose. In 2011, the University conducted a comprehensive study of IT infrastructure and renewal needs. This study included an analysis of investments needed to renew existing classroom technology and to ensure that all classrooms have appropriate and standardized technology that is refreshed periodically. Information gathered during the study will inform Brown's development of a new capital plan, in which IT needs must remain a priority.

Although significant investments continue to flow to campus physical and technological needs, those needs continue to grow as Brown seeks to support the expanding ambitions of its expanded faculty. We have taken important steps to improve our approach to the ongoing challenges of aligning renewal needs, academic priorities, and capital resources. Those steps include more formalized, comprehensive, and periodic assessment of the needs, a major push to clear the renewal backlog, and greater visibility at the Corporation level of the portfolio-management view of campus facilities. Success will be measured in continued emphasis on increasing the annual renewal allocation, and in planning major renovations of aging academic buildings even as new building projects are undertaken in the future.

9. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

When the NEASC evaluation team visited Brown in spring 2009, it was becoming clear that we were in the midst of a severe global recession. The crisis in the financial markets during 2008-09 reduced the overall value of the University's endowment by $740 million, roughly one-quarter of the nearly $2.8 billion that the endowment had been worth on June 30, 2008. In developing the University's operating budgets for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, we anticipated lower than planned income across nearly all of the University's revenue sources and took steps to realign our expenditures to available resources, as described in response to Special Emphasis Area 1: Implementation of the Plan for Academic Enrichment and Adaptations Resulting from Economic Uncertainty.

When President Simmons announced her plan to step down, she made clear that the goals of the PAE were ongoing and that, although financial challenges remained, Brown needed to sustain its momentum during the presidential transition. Accordingly, she worked with the administration and the Corporation on an interim financial and fundraising plan designed to ensure that progress would continue on Brown's goals. In February 2012, the Corporation approved an interim plan that includes investments in specific academic areas – Engineering, Brain Sciences, Public Health, and the humanities – as well as capital investments in research equipment, IT infrastructure, residence hall renewal, and research space. Financial aid and faculty support remain enduring priorities. These planned investments require Brown to raise $600 million in new gifts and issue approximately $130 million in additional debt over the next several years. Over the course of the spring, President Simmons also negotiated an 11-year agreement with the City of Providence primarily focused on helping the City manage through its extreme financial challenges. The financial implications of the agreement have been incorporated into our financial projections.

In fundraising, Brown's Campaign for Academic Enrichment, completed in December 2010, raised more than $1.6 billion, exceeding our original goal of $1.4 billion by $200 million. The Campaign was not only successful in terms of the overall goal, but also in terms of specific objectives regarding distribution of endowments, current-use funds, and capital gifts, as well as elevating giving to new sustainable levels. During the Campaign, average annual cash receipts were approximately $166 million. Cash receipts for 2011-12 were more than $170 million. The amounts raised for the Brown Annual Fund increased from about $15 million in 2002-03, the first year of the Campaign, to $36 million in 2010-11. The annual fund reached more than $36 million for 2011-12. In addition, Brown has received a number of multi-year pledges in support of the goals included in the $600 million near-term fundraising plan.

The economic uncertainty and the freezing of credit markets in 2008 highlighted the importance of liquidity. During 2008-09, Brown took a number of steps to address risk proactively. The University significantly reduced the endowment's equity exposure and increased the allocation to cash and fixed income investments. In the summer of 2009, Brown issued $100 million of 10-year taxable bonds to enable further enhancements in its liquidity. These steps ensured that funding was available to meet the demands of the University operating budget and the University's funding obligations to private equity investments. Brown's investment portfolio continues to be well diversified. We achieved an 18.5% return in 2010-11; our 1% return in 2011-12 was consistent with the generally low results of our peers. Over the past 10 years, the endowment's average annual return has been 7.7%, which compares favorably to those of our peers. Given the continued volatility in the financial markets, we are reviewing our assumptions for endowment return and endowment payout, which are key parameters in our multi-year financial plans.

In keeping with the NEASC team's recommendation that the administration expand its engagement with the activities of the Internal Audit office, the Senior Vice President for Planning and Policy has been leading a group of senior administrators – including the University Auditor, the Associate Vice President for Research, the Director of Environmental Health and Safety, and the Assistant Vice President & Deputy CIO – in a Risk Management and Emergency Preparedness process. The Risk Management and Emergency Preparedness (RMEP) Working Group, now chaired by the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, has responsibility for crisis management and planning, risk assessment and policy development, emergency preparedness and training, and related activities. At its monthly meetings, the group has identified key risks, evaluated Brown's approach to managing those risks, and approved measures for improving Brown's level of compliance, internal controls, ability to recover from disasters, emergency preparedness, and business continuity. The Corporation's Audit Committee is kept fully apprised of the group's findings, processes, and progress.

The financial downturn served to intensify the already strong connection between financial and academic planning fostered under the PAE and the Campaign for Academic Enrichment. As noted above, this close coordination has continued during the presidential transition period. We continue to be focused on managing and building our financial resources to support Brown's mission. Over the course of 2012-13, the process of developing and refining the University's institutional ambitions and goals for the next decade and beyond will of necessity be accompanied by the development of longer-term financial, capital, and fundraising plans, which we will be able to report on in detail in 2018.

10. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

The economic downturn created an opportunity to reorganize the Office of Public Affairs and University Relations (PAUR) to be more responsive and relevant in a dynamic and rapidly evolving media environment. This was followed in 2011 by a strategic planning process focused on two key goals: better integrating functions to provide improved service to the University, and ensuring that the work of Brown faculty and students was having a meaningful impact on conversations and policy deliberations locally, nationally, and internationally.

A major project of the last few years was to overhaul *brown.edu* so that it showcased the University's distinctive character through video and digital media content and a more intuitive navigation design. We also sought to develop a University-wide identity and to adopt a user-friendly content management system that would empower various departments and areas of the University to manage their newly revised sites. Since launching the new home page, the web services team has redesigned 110 subsidiary sites, including Admissions, Financial Aid, the

Office of the Vice President for Research, the Alpert Medical School, and the Graduate School. Brownsites (the name of the next-layer sites that offer a level of continuity across the web) were used for the important ROTC and Athletic review announcements, and for the Presidential Search and announcement of Brown's 19th President.

PAUR media staff gather and create a rich array of content to post to the web, pitch to traditional outlets, and push out through a variety of newer tools and publication venues. Five years ago, Brown did not have a social media presence. Since 2009, Brown has launched platforms in Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, iTunes, Google+, LinkedIn, and Flickr, and PAUR's social media specialist coordinates with partners across the university and shares best practices. We have launched a mobile site, and a team is in place to ensure that the site evolves to meet the needs of various groups and constituencies.
Our multipronged communications plan carries information about Brown's teaching, research, service, and impact to the campus, our neighboring community, broader audiences, alumni, opinion leaders, and government officials. We proactively seek, write, and pitch stories to local, national, and international media. We repurpose these stories through a newly launched *News from Brown* e-letter that is sent weekly to 14,000 members of the Brown community; through the *Insider* e-letter that Alumni Relations produces and sends to 55,000 alumni; and by bundling and sharing stories with elected officials at the city, state, and federal levels. The *Brown Alumni Magazine* is mailed to 90,000 alumni and families around the globe, and has a companion web site accessible to all. We monitor key indices of our communications outreach efforts, such as web traffic, top stories, video interest, location of visitors, and top web destinations.

Brown's ability to communicate the importance of its work and advance its key interests (and those of higher education more generally) at all levels of government is critical to the University's continued progress. The Director of Government Relations works closely with the Provost, Vice President for Research, Director of Financial Aid, and others to develop and advance the University's federal agenda and profile. This work includes campus visits by federal officials as well as faculty trips to Capitol Hill and federal agencies. We help inform campus constituencies about federal policy and funding issues, and regularly send to Rhode Island's Congressional delegation and their key staff members information about Brown's activities and impact. We work directly with members of Congress, federal agencies and staff, and in conjunction with peers through federal associations such as AAU, NAICU, ACE, AAMC, The Science Coalition, and Ad Hoc Tax Group. Primary areas of interest include federal legislation, regulations, and policies and programs that affect higher education generally and Brown specifically (e.g. federally funded university-based research, student aid, tax issues, philanthropic giving and anything that may affect Brown as a major employer). We also work to inform discussions about issues such as accountability, college cost, access, and the proper role of the federal government.

At the state and local levels, we also engage in ongoing efforts to convey directly to government and civic leaders the value, significance, and contributions of Brown. Our Director of State and Local Relations is a familiar presence at the State House and City Hall. Another State House lobbyist is retained through General Counsel's office. Internally, many other individuals across the University contribute to state and local affairs in a variety of forms – from serving on boards and commissions, to working on zoning, planning and permitting, and public safety and through community service. We seek to coordinate, collaborate, showcase, and provide a strategic framework for these endeavors. Brown works closely with civic groups such as the Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce, Providence Plan, Providence Foundation, and the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities on state and local issues of interest and importance. Much of the focus of this work in recent years has been supporting efforts through investments and advocacy to advance the knowledge-based economy in Providence.

On the local level, our community liaison has developed a series of meetings and activities to communicate with neighbors and to invite them to take advantage of a range of campus resources. We have had more active outreach for events on campus, regular open forums that offer programming or an opportunity to meet on a particular – usually construction related – topic, and are in regular communication with neighborhood associations about working together in mutually beneficial ways. The University has a series of regular activities for area residents that we advertise through various publications and via the web and social media, including concerts, movies nights, theater nights, and open skating at Meehan Ice Rink.

As projected in our 2008 self-study, the Vice President for Public Affairs and University Relations now convenes a University Communicators group quarterly to share information, develop shared goals, and optimize resources. PAUR continues to work closely with the Media Relations Advisory Council, having bi-annual meetings and providing regular updates. The Advancement Committee of the Corporation provides general oversight. There is a Community Working Group comprised of University officials and representatives of the neighborhood associations, and an internal working group that coordinates engagement at the city and state level. The Cabinet, senior staff, and ultimately the President provide general and regular oversight and strategic direction.

Looking ahead, we will need to keep abreast of the rapidly evolving communications and media technologies in order to have the tools to continue advancing the University's profile and impact. PAUR opened a new broadcast studio in August 2012. A new social media dashboard is being created to centralize and surface social media channels from across Brown. We will also launch a video library to host and showcase the array of materials created throughout the University. With a newly appointed president firmly on board, the solid foundation established through the PAE, the University's upcoming 250th anniversary in 2014, and a likely capital campaign, the next five years promise to be active ones for Brown's public communication. PAUR will continue to partner across the University to highlight and advance University priorities that result from a President/Provost led strategic planning process. A planning committee for the University's 250th anniversary celebrations has been appointed and has met approximately five times in the past 18 months. A subcommittee structure has been formed and a full-time staff director has been hired. Communications and engagement around and in support of this important milestone will be essential.

11. INTEGRITY

Since our last ten-year review, Brown has continued to implement policies and take steps to ensure compliance with best practices of institutional integrity and transparency. In the area of overall institutional management, we have adopted a comprehensive records management and retention policy following a process that involved the Office of the General Counsel, the University Library, Computing and Information Services, and representation from the university's academic and business offices.[23] This is consistent with the best practice referenced in the University's 990 Tax Return.

During the 2011-2012 academic year, the Brown Corporation approved two documents related to conflict of interest. The first of these was the Institutional Conflict of Interest Policy, which applies to senior officers of Brown who are in a position to make decisions on behalf of the University. The second of these was a revised Conflict of Interest Policy for Officers of Instruction and Research. The primary purpose of this revision was to incorporate the new guidelines and requirements from the National Institutes of Health that are required for all researchers who have NIH grants. The University also amended the Conflict of Interest policy for Corporation members to include questions and materials germane to the completion of the University's 990 Tax Return. In addition to disclosing any other conflicts, members are required to identify relationships with vendors or contractors that the University lists as having a significant relationship with the University.

The Office of the General Counsel conducted training sessions regarding University obligations and responsibilities regarding sexual assault and sexual harassment for a wide range of groups, including senior administration, Student Life, Athletics, and department chairs and center directors. These sessions included guidance on compliance with Title VII, Title IX, and the Department of Education's rules as referenced in the April 2011 Dear Colleague Letter. During the 2012-13 academic year, we will launch a new, university-wide on-line sexual harassment training for all staff and faculty, supplemented by a more robust effort to deliver one-on-one or face-to-face training to departments and/or units that request or may need or benefit from additional discussion about university sexual harassment policies and procedures. Counsel also provided guidance and instructions on University policy and state laws regarding minors on campus.

In response to the Dear Colleague letter referenced above, Brown also made modest changes to its Academic and Student Conduct Codes. The most significant change was to expand the appeal process to permit those filing complaints to appeal decisions and penalties in addition to the appeal accorded to the student who received the adverse decision or penalty. Other changes clarified policies and procedures that provide for prompt and equitable redress of instances of sexual assault of students. Additionally, we revised our Policies and Procedures Manual for Student Athletes in 2010 to update NCAA, Ivy League, and Eastern College Athletic Conference compliance rules as well as University procedures for dispute resolution within athletics.

[23] http://library.brown.edu/collections/archives/recordsmgt.php.

III. ASSESSMENT, RETENTION, AND STUDENT SUCCESS

A. Undergraduate Education

When NEASC last visited Brown in 2009, the College had just completed a comprehensive review of Brown's undergraduate curriculum. The review coincided with Brown's five-year appraisal of the PAE and was designed to provide grounding for our 10-year reaccreditation self-study. It was only the second time that Brown's "new" curriculum, launched in 1970, had been reviewed in this way.[24] The College was therefore highly motivated to ask fundamental questions about Brown's approach to liberal learning. Does the open curriculum remain relevant to today's students? Are students taking full advantage of Brown's rich learning environment? How can the College ensure that its students develop essential capacities for living and working in a world of multiplicity and change?

In its final report, the Task Force on Undergraduate Education affirmed the continued relevance of the Open Curriculum to Brown undergraduates.[25] It also identified areas that required attention to ensure that students make intentional educational choices and achieve Brown's liberal learning goals. The 15 major recommendations issued by the Task Force provided the College with a template for achieving this overarching goal.[26] Since 2008, the College has implemented all 15 recommendations, guided by a detailed plan of action included in the Task Force report.

Following a discussion of general measures of student outcomes, this section of our five-year report revisits two of the Task Force's major areas of focus: liberal learning and the concentrations, and assessment of teaching and student learning. (The task force also focused on a third area, academic advising and other forms of student support, which is discussed above under Standard 4: Academic Program.)

Measures of Success

At the most general level, available data indicate our overall success in the area of undergraduate education, and in producing noticeable improvements in recent years. Our retention and graduation rates (S1 form), student survey results (E form-Undergraduate General Claims), and students' post-graduate activities (S2 form) paint a consistent portrait of an actively engaged, highly intelligent, and motivated student body. Our graduates' activities suggest that Brown students leave here with the knowledge and abilities they need to succeed. Class of 2011 students' acceptance rates for medical school (81%) and law school (91%) are well above national norms (46% and 71%, respectively). Of those students reporting employment, roughly 50% work in one of four areas: education (17%), finance and banking (12%), technology (10%) and science (10%). Between 2008-09 and 2011-12, Brown undergraduates have garnered 146

---

[24] The College's first full review of the new curriculum occurred in 1989, under then-Dean of the College Sheila Blumstein.

[25] *The Curriculum at Forty: A Plan for Strengthening the College Experience at Brown* is available at http://brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/tue/downloads/.

[26] Task force recommendations, along with a detailed plan for implementation, are published at http://brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/tue/downloads/Task_Force_Plan_of_Action.pdf.

national or international competitive fellowships. This includes 96 Fulbright Fellows, six Rhodes Scholars and two Marshall Scholars. (The number of Brown Rhodes and Marshall Scholars increased by one each in the just-released 2012-13 results.)

Our students' estimate of their own intellectual and personal growth supports the impression that Brown's approach to liberal learning is working (E form-Undergraduate General Claims). According to preliminary results from the 2012 COFHE senior survey, Brown seniors report equivalent or greater acquisition of skills in all of the 27 measures for breadth and depth of study; critical thinking and active learning; tolerance and adaptability; scientific inquiry and quantitative skill; and personal responsibility and self-efficacy. Moreover, our seniors report significantly more growth than their peers at other institutions in breadth and depth of study as well as critical thinking, adaptability, and personal responsibility. Indeed, of the 24 separate measures in these four areas, our seniors report significantly more growth than their peers on 22. In the areas of foreign language acquisition, writing effectively, using quantitative tools, and understanding the process of science and experimentation, the Brown students report skills gain at a level commensurate with that of their peers at other COFHE schools. In no area do our seniors report skills gains lower than students at peer institutions.

Overall, our institutional data and student surveys reinforce the view that Brown continues to provide students with an exceptional undergraduate experience. Our 98% first-year retention rate, together with our 95% six-year graduation rate, speaks to our success in supporting students throughout the four years (see S1 form). Nearly all (98%) of our 2012 first-years report satisfaction with their overall experience at Brown. In 2011, a very high percentage (96%) of our enrolled students rated their educational experiences at Brown as excellent or good. The same percentage of students is happy with the quality of instruction, and 97% agree that faculty are willing to talk with them individually. These data all represent modest improvements from prior years and suggest that our efforts to improve advising are paying dividends.

While these measures of success are gratifying, by themselves they offer insufficient evidence of our students' development. As described below, the College has made a concerted effort in the last five years to implement systems that will allow us to directly measure our students' knowledge and skills gains.

Liberal Learning

One of the first issues considered by the Task Force on Undergraduate Education was the need to develop a new set of college-wide learning goals suitable to our current generation of students. The last such statement had been produced in 1989 during the College's last full curricular review. Even before the task force had completed its work, the College Curriculum Council (CCC) produced a new statement on liberal learning. This statement, called "Liberal Learning at Brown," begins by establishing the history and purposes of a liberal education, then goes on to outline a set of 11 capacities that students are expected to develop during their undergraduate years.[27] These capacities cut across disciplinary boundaries and thus demonstrate a key assumption of Brown's curriculum: that students will "make connections between

[27] The full text of "Liberal Learning at Brown" is available at http://brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/tue/downloads/Liberal_Learning_at_Brown.pdf.

courses." The statement on liberal learning includes not only intellectual capacities but also communication skills, and the cultivation of learning experiences beyond the classroom.

The College evaluates Brown's success in meeting these liberal learning goals in a number of ways. For example, an annual study is completed that examines the distribution of courses taken across the disciplines to ensure that, in the absence of traditional distribution requirements, students are taking courses in the College's four major divisions. In various surveys, including the biannual Senior Survey and the Alumni survey (conducted approximately every five years) students are asked to answer several questions about their use of the curriculum. The majority of respondents, which include enrolled students, seniors nearing graduation, and alumni ten-years after graduation, report making good use of the freedom afforded by the curriculum. Results of these studies are reviewed by the Office of the Dean of the College as part of their assessment of the Brown curriculum and advising programs.

Aside from the direct measures we have developed to assess students' skills in written communication (see below), the evidence that students meet Brown's liberal learning goals is mostly indirect, but also shows consistent self-reported skills gains both across time and in comparison to peers at comparison institutions. Results of these surveys as they relate to the liberal learning goals are described in the E form on Undergraduate General Claims. It is expected that more direct measures will be captured as concentrations continue to develop their learning outcomes and collect capstone projects and other documentation of student achievement. We anticipate that the various pieces of writing currently gathered in ASK will be especially useful to concentrations in this regard. Efforts are also underway to capture information about our alumni more systematically, which will provide an additional source of evidence for the impact of their undergraduate education.

Writing

The Task Force's fifth recommendation focused on writing. It directed the College to create systems for assembling a record of student writing and for demonstrating in a systematic way that all students worked on their writing during their college careers. An external review of Brown's writing support programs, conducted in 2007, provided a set of recommendations for carrying out this directive. Over the last five years, we have made a concerted effort to collect students' written work as the basis for systematic study of their abilities and acquisition of skills in writing. In 2008, the newly formed College Writing Advisory Board worked with the CCC to create a new statement about Brown's writing requirement. Updated this past spring, the statement clarifies students' responsibilities for working on their writing and for demonstrating that they have done so.[28]

The College's new statement on writing explains why writing is important and how students can develop their written communication skills at Brown. The 2008 version stated that all students must produce concrete evidence that they have worked on their writing, and encourages students to take courses that engage them in the writing process. The CCC refined

[28] The current statement on writing is at http://brown.edu/Administration/Dean_of_the_College/curriculum/documents/CCC_Statement_on_writing_2012.pdf.

this expectation over the next few years, so that, beginning with the Class of 2015, students must successfully complete at least one approved writing course in their first two years of study. Students meet this part of the writing requirement by taking a course in English, Comparative Literature, or Literary Arts, or by taking one of the hundreds of courses across the curriculum marked with a WRIT designation.[29] As juniors and seniors, students are required to demonstrate that they have worked on their writing a second time, either by taking an additional approved writing-intensive course, or by uploading significant written work from another Brown course and explaining how the document demonstrates their developing writing skills. Last year, the College began working with selected departments to archive their graduating seniors' capstone work, thus closing the loop on students' writing activities across the four years.

Our ability to gather, archive, and assess student writing has been greatly facilitated by ASK, our online advising tool (discussed above under Standard 4: Academic Program). ASK has been designed to function as a repository for students' best work, including their samples of writing that fulfill the requirement. ASK thus allows advisors to track students' progress as writers and thinkers over four years. The system is structured to encourage students to reflect on their own growth over the course of their undergraduate career at Brown. Indeed, the College has expended significant effort in the last few years to make moments of reflection an integral part of students' intellectual development.

Such reflections begin even before incoming students arrive on campus for orientation. Before coming to Brown, new students write a letter to their advisors in which they discuss a summer reading assignment and outline their academic interests and goals. These letters (submitted by 98% of first-year matriculants over the last four years) are uploaded and stored in ASK and assessed by our Writing Center associates for competence in written expression. Students whose writing falls below baseline expectations are required to take a writing course in their first year of study. During their first two years, students are reminded to upload samples of their best work into an online portfolio in ASK and to write short reflections about their writing abilities. Once a student has completed this task, the advisor is notified via email and invited to read what the student has written.

When, at the end of the sophomore year, students choose an academic concentration, they are again asked to write a reflective essay, this time to defend their choice of concentration in the context of their liberal studies. The online concentration declaration form encourages students to engage in an iterative writing and advising process as they move through this process. A student's declaration essay must include some thoughts on his or her writing up to that point, along with a plan to work on writing in the concentration. Thus, by the time students declare their concentrations, advisors have the beginning of a narrative about students' educational development. Even more important, students have that narrative, too. Sophomores can easily look back at their first letter to see how their goals have evolved or changed. For seniors, seeing the arc of their entire four years can be profound. As a dimension of liberal learning, this kind of reflective practice is essential for students to understand their development in an open curriculum.

---

[29] All courses that meet the Writing Requirement can be viewed in Brown's Course Schedule. To view a complete list of all WRIT courses, select "All" departments and then select "Writing Designated Courses" under Curricular Programs.

In the next five years, we anticipate engaging in a large-scale assessment of student writing. When the Class of 2016 graduates, we will have robust writing portfolios for the first two classes that will fulfill our enhanced writing requirement. Our plan is to conduct a random-sample assessment of student writing for these two classes. Starting with the pre-matriculation letter students write to their advisors, and ending with senior-year writing samples, we will attempt to measure student gains in written communication over the four years. Disaggregated data, combined with students' self-reported gains in institutional surveys, will be distributed to departments and concentrations.

Assessment in the Concentration

In addition to paying greater attention to the assessment of liberal learning goals generally and writing in particular, we are also focusing on ways to connect learning outcomes to concentration curricula. The discussion of curricular goals and outcomes is a routine dimension of the strengthened concentration review process (described above under Standard 4: Academic Program). But we are also pressing forward with a variety of new methods and tools for assessment of learning in all concentration programs.

Brown's Sheridan Center for Teaching and Learning has assumed an active role in this process, working with selected departments on a new initiative to develop concentration assessment plans. Funded by a grant from the Teagle Foundation, the initiative engages faculty fellows in departmental and cross-institutional discussions about decoding the disciplines and translating their "ways of knowing, understanding, and doing" into learning outcomes. The first year of this program focused on three departments: Anthropology, Chemistry, and Geology. Working with Sheridan Center staff, faculty fellows from each discipline developed learning outcomes for concentration goals at three levels: introductory, developing, and master. These outcomes are being "mapped" on to the concentrations' curricula so that faculty can see the developmental pathways through the concentrations. Faculty fellows from Education and Economics will engage in their own mapping activities in 2012-2013. Other departments have learned about the Teagle Fellows' work and are keen to adopt some of these practices. We therefore plan to create an online resource that spells out the steps departments can take to articulate more specific learning outcomes and map them to concentration courses.

Examining disciplinary understandings and mapping them on to curricula provide faculty with critical information about their concentrations' learning goals. Faculty also need meaningful ways to assess their students' success in achieving concentration objectives. The review of senior concentrators mentioned above is one important piece of such assessment. Another essential component is a systematic method for evaluating teaching and for using student feedback to inform future course offerings. Brown has made significant strides in this area since NEASC last visited our campus. At that time, Brown had just launched a new online course evaluation tool. A major task force recommendation directed the creation of such a system, which would bring some degree of regularity to a process that had been paper-based and inadequately systematic. Until recently, each department had its own course evaluation form that reflected its particular faculty's concerns. In fact, a 2006 course evaluation audit by the CCC revealed that 42 different evaluation forms were then in use. Each term, students were confronted with three or four different evaluation forms, some of which used Likert scales that directly conflicted with each other. Needless to say, students were confused, and the University lacked a uniform measure of teaching effectiveness.

In spring 2008, the College piloted an online course evaluation form with seven departments. Every semester since then, some version of the online course evaluation form has been made available to all departments. Each semester's form was revised according to extensive feedback from faculty, students, and departments. Last year, when the evaluation system was integrated into Banner, our student and course information system, 43 out of 51 departments and programs used the online course evaluation system. Departments and individual faculty may continue to opt out and use paper forms, but we anticipate that all departments will eventually migrate most if not all of their courses to the system because of its ease of use and its enhanced reporting functions.

The new course evaluation system contains five base forms, each of which is designed to meet the needs of different types of courses in the humanities and social sciences; the physical and natural sciences; courses with integral labs; foreign language courses; and performance and applied fine arts courses. Departments can add as many custom questions as they wish to the forms, and they may also deselect many of the standard questions. However, every form contains a set of five questions that cannot be removed: one text-response question on the quality of student learning, two Likert-scale questions on course effectiveness and teaching, and two text-response questions on course effectiveness and teaching. These questions provide the University with a standard metric for evaluating teaching and learning departments across the four divisions of the College.[30]

Student feedback on the new course evaluation system has been uniformly positive. Students appreciate the freedom to complete course evaluations on their own, at a time in the term that works best for them. For many students, that time is after final exams have been completed. For this reason, the course evaluation period extends two weeks beyond the end of any given term, closing on the same date that faculty must turn in final course grades. A grade block feature enabled by our Banner system prevents students from viewing a final grade until they either complete an evaluation for the course in question or indicate that they prefer not to. This system has resulted in a 90% completion rate for participating courses in 2011-12.

At the end of an evaluation period, instructors can read their course evaluations using a convenient online viewer. Paper reports aggregate student responses to specific questions, thus improving faculty members' ability to assess particular aspects of their courses. Reporting has also transformed departments' ability to incorporate student feedback into decision-making about courses and teaching appointments. The system currently provides departments with the reports listed below. We continue to work with department chairs to identify ongoing reporting needs and the best ways to meet them through the course evaluation system.

- Course instructors receive all individual evaluations, grouped by course; responses to each Likert-scale question grouped by course; and narrative responses grouped by

[30] PDFs of the five base forms, along with explanatory information about the evaluation system, can be viewed on our Faculty Governance website at http://www.brown.edu/Faculty/Faculty_Governance/FEC/index.html.

course and question.

- Teaching assistants receive reports on the section of questions specifically about TAs.
- Department managers, chairs, and directors receive the same information as faculty, plus the following:
  - Individual evaluations grouped by course type (e.g., all ENGL 0110 sections, all CHEM 0360 labs)
  - Aggregate data on Likert-scale questions by course and across courses
  - Text box question responses grouped by course and question

The new online course evaluation system has vastly improved our ability to evaluate teaching effectiveness. Departments have always been expected to include information on teaching when sending recommendations for teaching appointments to the Dean of the Faculty. Our new course evaluation system is designed to facilitate such reporting and to provide the Dean of the Faculty with standard measures of teaching and learning across departments. Individuals applying for promotion and tenure are required to include teaching evaluation information in their supporting materials. The Tenure, Promotions and Appointments Committee tells us that the new reports greatly enhance their ability to evaluate faculty members' contributions to Brown's teaching mission.

Projection

The changes implemented by the College in the last five years ensure that Brown students will continue to receive the best possible advising and teaching in the years ahead. Of course, more work remains to be done. Assessment of student learning remains our top priority. To that end, we will conclude the concentration reviews and continue our work helping departments map concentration courses to learning outcomes. Departments will be asked to develop a regular plan for reviewing the work of each graduating class to see if students are learning what the faculty intend. A study of undergraduate writing will be completed and presented to the faculty. And for the first time ever, standard course evaluation data will be available to faculty, department heads, and senior administrators. By 2018, our efforts will allow Brown to present a much more nuanced picture of student learning at Brown.

Developing this conversation with our faculty is perhaps our most important area of focus in the years ahead. Based on our experiences from the first two years of our Teagle Foundation-funded project described above, we know that faculty are eager to examine their disciplinary outcomes and to make their programs' developmental pathways visible for students. We are exploring how to support these efforts in all departments. The large-scale assessment of student writing planned for 2017 will also provide important information for concentrations and departments, which will be asked to report on how they use the information provided to assess their programs. Further development of ASK (Advising Sidekick) may enable it to serve as platform for departments to manage their learning outcomes. The idea is to create a module that allows departments to tag courses with liberal learning outcomes as well as outcomes specific to their concentrations. When students upload materials, concentration faculty can review the work with particular learning outcomes in mind. Our new online course management system, Canvas, could make this process transparent to students by automatically displaying learning outcomes for each course. Finally, assessment will be an important component of our experiments with new online modalities for curricular innovation and support (see Standard 4: Academic Program).

B. Graduate Programs

At Brown, as elsewhere, graduate education is structured around long-established mechanisms of disciplinary assessment (qualifying examinations, dissertation defense, professional conference presentations, and peer reviewed publication) and guided by field-specific expectations (including competency with linguistic, quantitative, or technical skills) that are built into the requirements of graduate programs. The S- and E-Series forms contain data for a number of basic assessment measures, such as attrition and time-to-degree. For example, the S2 form is linked to reports published annually on each graduate program on a variety of student measures as well as attrition and time to degree.

Collecting and maintaining graduate student career outcome data is critical for our assessment activities. The Graduate School surveys students at the time they earn their PhD on their immediate career plans (see S2 form). Information about students' professional activities once they leave the University is gathered unevenly across departments. We are now working to develop a better set of campus-wide practices in this respect. More necessary outcome assessment tasks are associated with new programmatic developments (described in Special Emphasis Area 4: Strengthening the Graduate School). For example, the Open Graduate Education pilot program, in which selected PhD students pursue a master's degree in another field, provides new opportunities for rigorous cross-disciplinary training that will be assessed by tracking participating students' academic and professional development. Similarly, we will need to study the impact on completion and careers of the new Dissertation Completion Proposal funding mechanism, which provides competitive, merit-driven funding for students who require support beyond the five-year guarantee. It is always important to bear in mind that the time involved in doctoral education and in launching careers makes any assessment exercise a long-term proposition.

IV. PLANS

As noted at the outset, and reiterated throughout the report, the ways in which Brown will continue from the PAE – both building upon its successes and addressing areas where its work is yet unfinished – are in the process of being identified, deliberated over, and evaluated. In her letters to the campus of July 24, 2012, at the outset of the strategic planning effort, and of September 7, 2012, following intensive retreat-format discussion (see Appendix IX), President Paxson described the principles on which the process is based and identified several core objectives:

- Strive for increasing excellence in teaching and research
- Increase Brown's impact locally and globally
- Seek partnerships with other institutions to leverage Brown's strengths
- Provide the financial support needed to attract an exceptionally talented, diverse, and global student body
- Prepare students for life in a technologically driven, rapidly changing, and globalized society
- Be innovative in the development and use of digital technology for research, teaching, learning, and connecting with one another across the campus and around the world
- Reimagine the campus' physical environment (both on College Hill and beyond) to enhance our mission

The planning process that has taken shape consists to a large extent of a series of committees involving faculty, administrators, and (where appropriate) students.[31] The committees are charged with developing recommendations in the following areas: Faculty Recruitment, Retention, Development and Diversity; Financial Aid; Educational Innovation; Doctoral Education; Online Teaching and Learning; and Reimagining the Campus and Community. These committees will either draw from or connect with many of the existing structures of faculty and student organization. Smaller planning efforts for significant areas not covered in the main process (e.g., the role of master's programs) may follow. There will also be opportunities for the wider community of faculty, staff, and students to articulate their suggestions and concerns. Among other things, in order to identify the resources, or "scholarly infrastructure," that faculty members need to be optimally productive as a scholars and teachers, we have fielded a faculty survey, the results of which will be discussed in open forums and will serve to inform the work of the various committees. The President has also convened two consultative committees composed of Corporation members and alumni: one focused on campus planning, and the other on information technology.

The strategic planning committees were organized at the end of September and began meeting in October. Each committee submitted a progress report on their work to the President and Provost in early December. The University's leadership will provide feedback to committee chairs and co-chairs over winter break, and a one-day retreat in January will allow all committees to come together to share their ideas. A series of spring campus forums will allow faculty, students, and staff to contribute their ideas for the future, and we anticipate that the University

[31] http://brown.edu/about/administration/strategic-planning/.

will have completed a strategic plan by the end of the spring term.

Two important dimensions of the planning process are not immediately evident in the committee structure: diversity and internationalization. The President and Provost determined that, rather than risk isolating a significant set of institutional goals in separate committees, all committees should be responsible for strengthening the diversity of our campus and the University's international reach.

In parallel with the work of these committees is a process to identify a small number of major academic initiatives for Brown to pursue. Over the last several years, we have made a number of significant commitments that are moving forward, including the School of Engineering, the Brown Institute for Brain Science, Public Health's elevation to a school, and a Humanities Initiative focused on collaborative activities. We think we can support perhaps two or three additional major new efforts that build on Brown's distinctive strengths and collaborative ethos. In a campus-wide process, all faculty were invited to submit their best ideas for proposed initiatives involving any combination of talent in the arts, the humanities, the social, natural, and physical sciences, mathematics, or engineering. During the development of these proposals, faculty members were invited to attend and participate in a symposium at which preliminary plans were presented and discussed. We envision that the initiatives ultimately selected for support will (1) focus on significant problems or questions where Brown could make an impact on society; (2) build on existing strengths and focus on areas where Brown has or could have a comparative advantage; (3) have strong faculty leadership; (4) take advantage of Brown's collaborative culture and engage the participation of scholars from numerous parts of the campus; (5) involve undergraduate and graduate education; and (6) have strong funding potential.

The process by which signature academic initiatives will be selected is occurring over a somewhat more extended timeline. Groups of faculty submitted more than 80 proposals by the December 3 deadline, from which six to eight (some of which may consist of clusters of overlapping proposals) will be selected by the Academic Priorities Committee (APC) for further exploration and development. This process will begin in spring 2013 and continue into the fall term. During this stage, the Provost will make financial and administrative support available to facilitate retreats, symposia, and other developmental activities. Outside reviews may also be sought. After this period of review and consultation, the APC will be asked to make a set of recommendations to the Provost, President, and Corporation. Two or three initiatives will ultimately be selected for major support, with final approvals during the 2013-2014 academic year. For the most promising of the proposed initiatives that are not selected through this process, we will also seek to identify the means to encourage them at a lower level of investment.

Because the current planning effort is largely evolutionary in character – building on the PAE rather than seeking to supplant it – we do not anticipate developments that would constitute substantive change as defined by NEASC. As plans unfold, however, we will continue to consult with NEASC on the extent to which proposed actions and goals require consideration from the perspective of accreditation.

APPENDICES

a. Affirmation of Compliance with Regulations Relating to Title IV.

b. Most Recent Audited Financial Statement

c. The Auditor's Management Letter

d. Interim Report Forms

e. Student Achievement and Success Forms

   1. S Series

   2. E Series

Supplemental Materials (Available at http://www.brown.edu/Project/NEASC/2013)

I. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Faculty Development 2010

II. PAE Status Report, September 2011

III. Sample department review materials

IV. CCC Guidelines

V. CCC Report Sample

VI. IR & COE Interdisciplinary Review Reports

VII. Graduate Council Report Sample

VIII. Capital Projects

IX. President's Letter on Strategic Planning