

Note: This is an unapproved transcription. Please send any corrections to Diane LaLonde (DDL4@cornell.edu)

Cornell University Faculty Forum

February 20, 2002

Professor Alan Bell, Animal Science and Chair, Task Force on Professorial Titles: "I think in the interest of getting as much discussion into this hour and a half session as possible, we will start right on time. Welcome to today's faculty forum to discuss enabling legislation for the creation of a title of clinical professor. My name is Alan Bell. I am from the Department of Animal Science, which (for some of you in the room) is not in the College of Veterinary Medicine; it is in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. I will be moderating the forum today and will introduce our panelists in a moment. First off, I want to make a few comments, very brief comments, about the topic of discussion and some procedural points.

"The proposal we are considering was developed by the Task Force on Professorial Titles of which I am presently Chair, although I must acknowledge that Bill Fry was Chair for much of the group's most active period. And we have been meeting now for about sixteen months to discuss this and other topics. Task force members, of whom two are panelists, I will introduce in a moment, have developed a consensus in favor of the proposal that will be discussed today. I have to be very clear on that. This took a lot of conversation among us over the months, but that is a very clear point. We do want to assure the faculty that we are very open to alternative or additional suggestions. In fact this whole issue is now in the hands of the faculty. We were just the developers of a proposal here, which may yet be modified or even more than modified. We welcome, as I say, additional or alternative suggestions, and that is the major reason for this forum. We heard some excellent points at last week's Senate meeting, and I expect we will hear more today. I thought it was an excellent discussion last week. Those of you who were there, I hope you will agree.

"Some procedural details before we get going^¾ there are four panelists, and their names are listed here. I will not give them formal introductions but will name them here in a moment. I expect that they will^¾ I don't know what they are going to say, but I am anticipating that they will speak more or less alternatively for and against the proposal. Each will have five minutes^¾ strict time limit. I have my handy-dandy timer here. We will then follow with statements from the floor, which will be restricted to three minutes each. Speakers and anyone among the faculty here or not are invited to post written comments at the faculty forum web site, which is at the bottom of the overhead. < <http://web.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty>>. The easiest way to do that is to send your message to Diane LaLonde at DDL4, or I guess you could if you wish to hazard an alternative, send them to Bob at JRC7. The next point is that, as Bob just reminded me, the proceedings are being recorded, and transcripts will be available we expect in a week or so. Transcripts of last week's Senate meeting will also likewise be available. Finally, I must make sure that everybody understands that this is a meeting for discussion and is a non-voting meeting. The proposal may be put to a vote as early as the next Faculty Senate meeting on March 13.

"OK. With no further ado, I am going to just name each of our four panelists, and really do no more than read what is on the overhead here. Then without further introduction we will proceed from one statement to the next. Abigail Cohn is a member of our task force. She is also Chair of the Department of Linguistics and has been instrumental in helping, or rather leading, the task force in development of the enabling legislation document or proposal, which is also posted at this web site. Risa Lieberwitz is a professor in the School of Industrial and Labor Relations and spoke eloquently about this topic at the Faculty Senate meeting last week, and I am looking forward to her statement. Michael Kotlikoff is Chair of the Department of Biomedical Sciences in the Veterinary College, another member of the task force with a special interest in the specific consideration of the clinical professor title. Vicki Meyers-Wallen is also a professor in the Department of Biomedical Sciences at the Baker Institute for Animal Health, and Vicki was a very active participant in the discussions that the Veterinary College had last fall about the

clinical professor title. So I will now call on Abby Cohn to lead off, and you have five minutes."

Professor Abigail Cohn, Linguistics and member of the Task Force on Professorial Titles: "As we discussed last week, the central question posed by the task force is whether Cornell's set of available academic titles for long-term non-tenure track appointments are adequate. I don't want to repeat what I presented to the Senate last week. Rather, I would like to highlight and amplify a couple of points that I think are important to the debate.

[\(Overheads\)](#)

"What we are discussing is enabling legislation that, if approved by the Faculty Senate and subsequently by the Provost and the Board of Trustees, would allow implementation of the title clinical professor at the assistant, associate and full ranks on a college-by-college basis, as well as a specific proposal, approved by the majority of the tenure track faculty of the Vet College, to implement this set of titles. What we are not discussing at this time is a parallel proposal for the research sphere. This is partially because there has not yet been a college-specific proposal developed, and as we discussed last week for the clinical sphere, we felt it was very important to move forward in a tandem fashion. In addition, the issues are quite complex and are to some degree different in the two spheres. So the task force has proceeded in a deliberate fashion and on a case-by-case basis. The task force certainly could take up this question if there is support from the Senate for the clinical professor proposal.

"One of the questions that I have spent a lot of time thinking about is, 'Why should you care about the proposed enabling legislation for clinical professor if you are not from one of the professional colleges where the issues are perceived as pressing?' In fact, coming from Arts and Sciences, when the task force was first convened, it wasn't really apparent to me what these issues were. So I spent a lot of time thinking about this question, and I also benefited greatly from extensive discussions with colleagues on the task force from the professional colleges. There are a couple of points that I would like to highlight here.

"First, and I think for me most fundamentally, is the issue of fairness and the treatment of individuals in non-tenure track positions at Cornell. The addition of well-defined non-tenure track titles, in fact, would subject non-tenure track roles to greater scrutiny, thereby reducing the kind of ad hoc arrangements, which unfortunately abound currently. Also there is the question of support for our colleagues in other colleges to have appropriate job categories and to remain competitive vis-à-vis their peer institutions, even if we in our own provincial colleges don't feel the same need or in the same ways.

"Another question is, 'Why should the enabling legislation be on a college-by-college basis?' First, this ensures that the implementation of these titles by those colleges where there is a strong need will be thought out and guided by the faculty of those colleges. This protects against ad hoc uses of the titles in contexts for which they weren't intended. More basically, the task force felt that since this is a college specific issue to a large degree, if we had proposed implementation across the board, it would probably be doomed to failure at the outset.

"A question that came up last week and is obviously a very important one is the question of whether this proposal is attack on tenure. I strongly believe that it isn't. First of all, the status quo at Cornell involves a much wider range of use of titles than generally assumed. Even the unmodified title of professor, assistant, associate and full, does not necessarily entail tenure or probationary status for tenure, so some of this flexibility is actually outlined in the [Faculty Handbook](#).

I site here from the earlier edition; I gather the new edition is almost there. Under 'Professor and Associate Professor' it says, 'A new faculty member may be given a term appointment at this level for a fixed term of up to five years.' Interestingly, under 'Assistant Professor' it says, 'A qualified individual may be appointed as an assistant professor but not in a probationary tenure status. This may occur, for instance, when a department's staffing or programming needs or funds for the position are viewed as temporary in nature. Such an appointment can be for up to four years and is not likely to be considered for renewal.' I would like to point out the fact that there are numerous individuals across the university in these sorts of positions, and in fact these positions are not infrequently renewed.

"So what this proposal will affect most directly is the categories of non-tenure track titles and the individuals currently in them. The final point I will make very quickly is that this is not to say that protections against covert use of such titles to erode tenure are not important. We have one requirement built in, which is a percentage cap per

department, and we certainly welcome any additional suggestions about how to strengthen such protections."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: Thank you very much for inviting me, and I think this is a very important forum. I look forward to hearing the discussion. There are three points that I would like to make today that I hope will help to frame the issues for discussion and to provide some ideas for our discussion now and after today as well. So let me just identify the three points first, and then I'll go back and talk about each of them in turn. The first point is to ask the question, 'What are the goals that we should be trying to achieve here through this process?' Secondly, the point that I would like to discuss is an important one that I don't think has received enough attention, and that is that the proposed general enabling legislation for creation of new professorial titles and the Vet School's specific proposal for a new non-tenure track professorship should be evaluated independently of each other. The third point that I will then address is that I believe that there may be some important amendments that could be made to the general enabling legislation that would lead to a more open, more democratic and more full evaluation of specific proposals, such as the Vet School proposal.

"Now to my first point. What are our goals? It seems to me that the first goal to keep in mind is to protect the strong tenure system. That is not to maintain a hierarchy as a goal, but to protect the rights that correspond to tenure, which is a strong form of job security. At the heart of those rights is academic freedom, which is essential for all teaching and all research, and for the right to express views and opinions about the university. Job security - we are used to it in the form of tenure. It is essential to protect the rights of academic freedom, and this applies to all academic personnel, all academic appointments. We need to protect that freedom. The need to protect the tenure system is especially crucial now, because we are talking about these specific issues against a national background of boards of trustees and university administrators seeking to increase the number of non-tenure track faculty at the expense of tenure track positions. This is a reality, and we have to pay attention to it. Administrators have justified these actions as ways of making financial savings, but in reality such measures also undermine academic freedom by eroding the number of tenure track positions that we have. We have these two goals then. The third point in terms of goals that I would like to make is the important goal that has been raised in the Faculty Senate and just before³/₄ the goal of improving the status and respect given to existing non-tenure track faculty at Cornell, people who are in positions like instructors and lecturers, to recognize the importance of their work and to provide the rights of academic freedom and job security to non-tenure track faculty as well.

"Now this brings me to my second point - the separate issues that are in front of us. It should be, I think, noted importantly that the general enabling legislation should be evaluated separately from any specific proposal from a college or a school within Cornell. The Faculty Senate will be voting on the proposed enabling legislation for creation of new professorial titles on a college-by-college basis. The Faculty Senate will not be voting on any specific proposal from a college. Thus, the Senate vote on the enabling legislation is not a vote on the proposal from the Vet School. I think we should be clear on that. Now as a result, it is possible for the Faculty Senate to approve proposed enabling legislation and for the Vet School proposal to be considered and either approved or not approved by the appropriate Faculty Senate committee.

"Finally, to my third point. As I noted earlier, one general goal is to improve the status and respect provided to non-tenure track faculty in positions like lecturers or instructors. I personally (I said this at the Faculty Senate and I still believe it) I would favor extending the professorial tenure track line to include non-tenured faculty. I think that if we are going to give people the title of professor we should give them the full rights. However, I also believe that the enabling legislation to create new titles with some important amendments may be a first step toward addressing the issue of enhancing the respect and status given to non-tenure track faculty. Just very quickly, the amendments that I believe that could be addressed, and I'm glad to hear that it is work in progress, would include amendments to the enabling legislation to ensure that the criteria written into the enabling legislation would protect against adding new non-tenure track positions, as I believe the Vet School does, at the expense of tenure track positions, and would instead enable different schools on a college-by-college basis to change the titles of incumbent faculty to recognize the improvement of status of non-tenure track faculty who already exist."

Professor Bell: "Our next speaker is Professor Kotlikoff."

Professor Michael Kotlikoff, Biomedical Sciences and member of the Task Force on Professorial Titles: I just want to first of all discuss what I think the central issue of this proposal is and then go through some of the issues that

were raised at our last Faculty Senate meeting. I will try and parcel that out, both from the standpoint of the steering committee and also from the standpoint of the majority of the Veterinary College faculty. ([Kotlikoff overheads.](#))

"First and foremost, I think that the major aspect and the most important goal of this proposal is to treat people fairly. Many lecturers and senior lecturers at Cornell have qualifications, professional accomplishments and scholarly achievements that would result in titles of clinical professor in the majority of the veterinary colleges in the country, and indeed in our medical college if there were positions. This proposal seeks to appropriately recognize individuals whose passion and interest is clinical work and whose expertise requires the major commitment of time to the development and maintenance of clinical skills. These individuals contribute enormously to the mission of the Veterinary College and are a key element in the college's national and international reputation.

"So, what are the arguments against treating people fairly? The first argument is that the proposal will dilute the intellectual capital of the college and university through expansion of the non-tenure track ranks. Well, as Abby and Risa pointed out, there is a cap in this proposal. What are the current numbers? The current number of lecturers or senior lectures, already academic personnel, in the Department of Clinical Sciences, the major department that will be impacted by this proposal, is twelve. The total tenure track faculty number is thirty-six. Twenty-five percent of thirty-six is nine. We already have more lecturers and senior lecturers than would be enabled as clinical professors through this proposal, so I don't think that there is any real likelihood of expansion or dilution of intellectual capital. Secondly, by recruiting and treating individuals fairly and by appropriately enabling them to exercise their passion in clinical work, we also allow people in the tenure track or tenured individuals who have excessive clinical responsibilities to increase their non-clinical research component. Thirdly, relating to the last comment, Dean Smith has indicated throughout this process, that this proposal will not result in a decrease in tenure lines to any department. This is not used as a way of substituting clinical for tenure.

"What is another argument? Well, if you listen carefully to the debate, you will hear two sides of this argument. Argument one is that clinicians, who don't have a research background or strong research interests, should not be at Cornell, should not be recruited and should not be termed 'professor'. On the other hand, you will hear people that say that individuals that have strong clinical commitments and teaching responsibilities should be tenured. Unfortunately, the individuals in these positions go right squarely in the middle of this problem, and at time of tenure, they are impacted by different expectations by different groups of faculty. I would maintain that that is fundamentally unfair to those individuals. In addition to that, the Provost has said that she would like to see at least fifty percent of academic appointments as research appointments university-wide. That again provides an administrative expectation that I would say is unfair to individuals given a majority or an extensive clinical responsibility.

"The issue of what happens in our Medical College was raised. At our medical college, indeed, there is a tenure track. There is a non-modified academic clinical track. Those are individuals who are professor of medicine, no modification of the title, no tenure. They also have the ability to term equal assistant, associate or full professor of clinical medicine, which is analogous to the proposal by the Veterinary College. What has been said in the meeting was that they could not staff and run teaching hospitals at Weill without those individuals. Now there are, as was stated, a vast number (around 5,000) clinical assistant, associate or full professors. These are not employees of Cornell. They are volunteers, and I would submit are not really relevant for this argument. As I did state, nineteen out of twenty-six veterinary colleges utilize these titles, although the degree of implementation certainly varies. One other issue that was brought up was gender imbalance. There is nothing in this proposal that directly relates to gender imbalance. Some numbers were provided from the University of Pennsylvania. I have compiled the numbers from the two clinical departments that have had a clinical track for the last ten years. I would just state that by treating individuals fairly, by providing additional options in terms of title, I think we are only improving the flexibility and options of women in academia. I'll end there."

Professor Bell: "Thank you. Our next formal presentation is from Professor Meyers-Wallen."

Professor Vicki Meyers-Wallen, Biomedical Sciences: "I realize a lot of people are from the Veterinary College, but for those of you who are not, I want to let you know that I am speaking in opposition to this proposal, and I

want to give you some perspective on my position. I am a veterinarian and a Ph.D.; I received both of my degrees from the University of Pennsylvania. I am board certified in my clinical specialty; I practice in private practice, and I have practiced throughout my academic career. I teach genetics, development and reproduction in the veterinary curriculum. My research is funded by NIH, and I am a Faculty Senate member and a member of the UFC.

"The first effect of this proposal will be an exacerbation of gender inequities in the College of Veterinary Medicine by establishing a group of second class citizens who are women and veterinarians. (Overheads). This is the data from February of this month from the Clinical Studies Department of the University of Pennsylvania. What you see first is the total number of professorships, there is the tenure track professorship and the clinical educator is the non-tenure track professorial title. What you see is that, since this was instituted in 1983, which is nineteen years ago, that fifty-one percent of the faculty is now non-tenure track. Previously, they were all tenure track. If you add people who are like our instructors and staff veterinarians, what you see is that seventy percent of the faculty is now non-tenure track of some sort and only thirty percent are tenure track faculty. If we look at the distribution of the professors in the two tracks, the clinician educator and the tenure track (this is not counting the lecturers or instructors or the staff veterinarians), what you see is that the track got reversed in the proportion of men and women. That is in the tenure track, in the darker box the males are sixty-eight percent, the women are thirty-two percent. In the non-tenure track there are thirty-five percent women and sixty-five percent men.

"Now if you look at the number of faculty who were hired since 1983, because some said, 'Well, a lot of them are graduating later.'

I can tell you that forty-four percent of my class were women; that was in 1976, and over seventy percent of the veterinarians graduating from veterinary schools since about 1980 have been women^{3/4} seventy percent have been women. So it has been at least twenty years. If we look at the 1983 data, this is what has happened in that same department, in the Small Animal Department, and what you see is just the people hired since 1983 (tenure track dark, non-tenure track lighter) thirteen percent of the tenure track are males; twenty percent are females. In the non-tenure track, however, twenty-three percent are males and forty-three percent are women. If you look at just what is going into men in tenure track and what's going into women in the non-tenure track, there are about three to four times more women going into the non-tenure track positions. If you look at what they are doing, you will notice that most of the women in this track are in the lower rank. They are mostly assistant professors; there are eleven now, and only two associate professors.

Whereas, men and women in the tenure track have risen about the same. So this is a dead-end career move for women. There is no question about that.

"The proposal, basically if you want to sum it up, places women in a second class citizenship and also veterinarians. This citizenship has limited career opportunities; it has lower salaries; it has no job security, and it has no academic freedom. For that reason I think we should not adopt this proposal as it is in the Veterinary College.

"The second thing that I want to say is that the effect of this proposal will be a devaluation of scholarship in veterinary medicine. We were rated as the number one college in veterinary medicine in the nation only last year, and I think we have been for several times previously. We have an international reputation that's earned by clinicians who were tenure track faculty. They earned their reputation by publishing works that are used by veterinarians all through the world, practicing veterinarians all through the world. What we need to do is build upon this reputation to maintain our premier position in this profession. We are not going to just be premier because we happen to be Cornell. We have to earn it. There is no shortage of talented scholars in veterinary medicine now. These veterinarians have completed their internship and residency. They have obtained board certification and many of them have Ph.D.'s. They are not attracted by a non-tenure track position, and they are going to be attracted by tenure track positions where they have the ability and the opportunity to achieve recognition by tenure, which is only fair and just, really.

"Now, if this proposal is approved, the expected result is that there will be no more tenure track positions given to the increasing clinical programs, and this expectation was voiced by several department chairs, and here is one of them. The Department of Clinical has difficulty fulfilling its board obligations solely with its tenure track faculty.

Increasing the number of tenure track faculty is not a viable option, because it would mean loss from other departments. I think that message is very clear. What we need is more tenure track positions in the clinical track. Other departments want those tracks for themselves. I think one of the reasons might be also that the indirect cost rate for veterinary medicine is very low. Every time I get NIH grant funding, \$100,000 a year, \$60,000 goes for indirect costs in addition to my research, to the administration. That is human health related. Veterinary medicine is not necessarily human health related, and the grants that we have may not have high indirect cost charges. Nevertheless, that is the center of our academic program and our scholarship. We can't afford just for financial reasons to ignore our academic responsibilities. So I'll stop there, and thank you very much for asking me."

Professor Bell: "I would now ask for contributions from the floor. Please when you are recognized, would you stand, speak loudly and identify yourself and your affiliation."

Professor Kenneth Birman, Computer Science: "I would like to speak in favor of this proposal and actually in favor of the broader principles that it represents. Cornell long ago made commitments to remain a preeminent research institution. We have a great many world class researchers here whose balance of activities is inconsistent with the tenure requirements of the university and whose focus of interest is far from teaching for example. We're talking about soft money lines of one kind or another. We have already hired these people; they are here. I think the same situation applies to the clinical professor candidates. We should have a way to recognize their accomplishments. Many of these are world class individuals who would be tenured full professors in some situations elsewhere. I think that for Cornell to conflate a proposal to recognize the accomplishments of individuals with a gender and equality concern or other concerns, which are legitimate but quite separate, it would be unfortunate, because it locks these individuals into lines which appear at least to be less honorific than they should be. We have such people in the Department of Computer Science. Obviously clinical professor would not be the appropriate title for them. Research professor would be. This wouldn't in any way reduce the number of tenure track lines in computer science; it would simply recognize world class researchers for what they are."

Professor Tony Simons, Hotel School: "I want to sound a sort of cautionary note. This is a statement that might not win me all that many friends back home, but I feel like it needs to be said. I think this is legislation that may be needed in some parts of the university. There certainly seems to be some situations where it would do more good than harm. I think, though, that there is general agreement that the designation holds some potential for misuse. In individual schools it could be used to reduce tenure track lines, it could be used to increase the percentage of faculty who are beholden to the deans, to withdraw support for research, and to reduce the qualifications of Cornell's professorial faculty for expediency's sake. The legislation, as it now stands, places the primary onus for the regulation of such abuse in the hands of the individual school's tenure track faculty."

"I am from the Hotel School, and that onus makes me nervous and here's why. The Hotel School has only embraced the research mission at Cornell University in the last decade approximately. That means that many of our senior professorial faculty have little or no research background, likewise, the two of our deans who have been appointed from the faculty. (And one of those deans is on recent record as actively opposing the research mission of the Hotel School.) We have almost as many lecturers on our faculty as we have professorial faculty. These lecturers have historically been given the vote on many governance issues. For instance, when our faculty had a meeting to discuss this same policy, I requested that professorial and lecturer votes be tallied separately, and as a result there is presently a motion by a senior lecturer to have me recalled from the Faculty Senate. Lecturers, by the way, unanimously supported this legislation and the professorial faculty was exactly evenly split on the issue. Because of our faculty makeup and also because of our history the deans have considerable latitude at the Hotel School. The academic dean has told me enthusiastically about the many different uses that he can imagine for this designation."

"I am, in short, speaking merely as a faculty member. I do not think that the Hotel School can be trusted to manage this designation responsibly. I have heard similar sentiments from a colleague in another Cornell unit, and that person is not speaking today precisely because he or she is not tenured. I request in the strongest terms that the enabling legislation be revised so that strict policies defining appropriate and inappropriate uses of the title exist at the university level. These policies in turn must be rigidly enforced. Abuse of this title stands to undermine the quality and the standing of Cornell University. We must as a university prevent such an outcome."

Professor Winthrop Wetherbee, English: "I really don't have a statement, a position, on the proposal, because there are still some things that I don't understand, and I would like to ask for clarification of those. You made reference in your opening remarks to the courtesy title of clinical professor, and that phrase raised for me the question^¾ when we talk about the difference that would be made in the status of those to whom this title was given, what would that difference be? There seem to be contradictory views on whether this would confer greater job security. It would be recognition, but that's a term that could mean any of a number of things from full to empty. It would involve fairer treatment. Does this treatment involve necessarily anything more than simply the giving of a more dignifying title to people? It honestly is unclear to me, when I put together the four statements that have been made, just exactly what we are enabling in the legislation that we are considering, irregardless of the effect that it might have on the status of tenured faculty and on the significance of tenure. I just don't know what we are proposing to give to the people whose titles we are proposing to change."

Professor Bell: "Have you read the material that is posted on the web?"

Professor Wetherbee: "I have. I was here last week, and I still don't know."

Professor Bell: "Well, obviously there isn't time to spell out chapter and verse, but perhaps Professor Kotlikoff would give us some specificity here. If you don't take too long, Mike."

Professor Kotlikoff: "Sure. Well, just a couple of points. The proposal outlines a full process of recruitment as assistant professor, associate or full, guidelines for promotion, guidelines in terms of voting rights and responsibilities and protection for these individuals, all of which are handled, I think the steering committee felt, in a very uneven and ad hoc basis for lecturers and senior lecturers currently. So that's the major point that I would make."

Professor Brian Chabot, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology: "I would like to speak in favor of, certainly the enabling legislation, and I think also the motion on the clinical professors. My concern about this has been long standing. Essentially it happened almost the day I arrived at Cornell and realized how severely limiting the present suite of academic titles were to my equally able spouse. I am not alone, because I know many other dual career couples have had the similar situation that I faced, and that is that the limited range of opportunities which were at that time, almost thirty years ago, were rigidly enforced. It meant that there were great difficulties in finding suitable kinds of situations where she could be employed and develop her career. What has happened in the following years is that there has been some relaxation and some creativity in applying these and exceptions have been made almost regularly for those that discovered that the exceptions were even possible, which I did about eight or ten years ago. As a consequence, things are a little bit better. I think the university has been more welcoming and open to making arrangements, but these same titles are still with us. They are still restrictive, and they are restrictive not only within our community but they are restrictive relative to our competitors. I think it is long overdue that we start talking about other options, and I think the enabling legislation simply allows us to do that in an organized way."

Professor Richard Miller, Philosophy: "I would like to express agreement with the previous speaker who emphasized the importance of distinguishing between situations in different colleges. In all colleges the arguments that have been made in favor of opening opportunities for appreciation and prestige for people who deserve appreciation and prestige are, of course, relevant and important. By the same token, a title that comes to be seen as having the same prestige as a professor's title does make it easier to reduce the number of tenured positions. I think there is a trade off in which worries on both sides are serious. In recent weeks I have been impressed by an increase in calls for disciplining academics who are critical of U.S. foreign policy and are wrongly accused of doing so in an unpatriotic spirit on the part of people and organizations who, I think, would like to weaken tenure protections. In this context, it is important to protect milieus in which faculty can voice critical opinions without anxiety. I think in the Arts College, for example, (I only speak of that because it is my college) the worries that would be instilled among patriotic people genuinely open to critical voices would make it untimely to create this new category. In any case, I hope this concern would be taken seriously and taken as a worry that might apply in some college context but might very well not apply elsewhere on balance."

Professor Cornelia Farnum, Biomedical Sciences: "I would like to speak to the issue of the pragmatic argument that

we should be doing this because multiple veterinary colleges do this, and because Cornell Weill does this in order to be competitive. So what I did was, rather than relying on this report, I analyzed a variety of web sites and I have made over a dozen personal contacts to see what the situation is in veterinary medicine, and I think these data are more focused.

"First of all, there are really only four schools that have a significant number of professorial titles, and interestingly the University of Minnesota, which has the most, the title isn't a professorial title, the title is clinical specialist. Secondly, there are at least six schools that, yes, have a professorial title, but it is a title we don't want to emulate by the way these individuals are treated. They have either one-year appointments, special title appointments, no required scholarship or they are used differently by different departments. Finally, as the original chart said, there are at least seven schools that don't have the title. There are six that have less than ten percent of their faculty in these positions and most of them less than five [percent]. So I don't really find the argument compelling that for us to be competitive we need to be doing this.

"Now if you turn to the situation of Weill Medical School and I know my department chair has probably struggled with this, because these data, the handout comes from a 100 page booklet that they have on appointment and promotion of faculty at Weill Medical. If I use the Department of Medicine as an example, in a professorial title all individuals are hired into the tenure track. At the time of the tenure decision, they may remain in the tenure track or they may go to an either academic clinical track or academic research track, both non-tenured. All of these individuals will carry the title of Associate Professor of Medicine, however they might (and their word is) lateral to a modified professorial titles. That is, in the clinical track, which are assistant professors of clinical medicine or of the voluntary track, which again are not true Cornell employees, but they carry the title of Clinical Assistant Professor of Medicine, and there is also a research track. Then in addition to these, there is a non-professorial track where they are called by their disciplines, cardiologist for example, and they are also titles that are not associated with the faculty track. Now, I guess I ask myself . . . I don't know what compelled Weill Medical School to create this quantity of tracks, that made them feel that they needed to be discriminating between a Professor of Medicine and . . . one of the tracks, the tenure track here, two are non-tenure track, Clinical Professor of Medicine or Professor of Clinical Medicine. I think when they did that they opened up a Pandora's Box, and I find the argument not compelling. I feel that if we go to a micro-dissection of what we are talking about, either in the titles or responsibilities of individuals with professorial titles, that we are defeating our purpose as a broad-based academic institution."

Stuart Davis, Senior Lecturer, English: "I am the only non-tenure track faculty member on the task force, although somebody else might wish to contest that rather dubious distinction. The phrase non-tenure track faculty member might sound a little bit contradictory to some ears. This is the category in which I serve which is officially still that of academic non-faculty member, along with research associates, extension associates, librarians and senior lecturers and lecturers. I merely want to testify that in sixteen years at Cornell I have had a lot of experience in living with contradictions. It has been educational to say the least. Without racing the clock I hope to a deadline that will be enforced, without indeed exceeding it, I would like to do just two or three things here. One of them is to give a qualified support, and my reasons for it, to the enabling legislation that Abby Cohn and Risa have spoken relevantly about, and that has been presented to you; to distinguish that a little further from the proposals that may or may not be thought of as before this body, and finally just to tighten the qualification perhaps a little bit in response to a question that Pete Wetherbee raised.

"First, I certainly support the enabling legislation that we have worked on as a document in progress, and I would underscore Risa Lieberwitz's point that it is separable from particular proposals that have been made or that may be made under it. I think the document needs to be perfected; I think the guidelines for acceptable proposals need to be fortified. In conversation with colleagues in this and other colleges, I have got some ideas about that, and I believe Abby Cohn and Alan Bell and Mike Kotlikoff have as well. That being said, personally, I support what I understood to be the Vet College's proposal on relatively specific and narrow grounds. I might add that this support extends to a proposal that might come down the pike from the Law School, although that's entirely notional at this point. The Vet College's proposal promises on good faith to benefit a certain number of people who are definite presences, although in titular terms perhaps invisible or less visible presences, in the faculty as a whole. That's my second point. In other words, the respect and dignity issue, the humanity issue and the status issue are matters that I should think would be highly meaningful to people in the Vet College and in Law. Finally, on the question of

potential campus wide development of ideas along these lines to address existing inequities or existing problems of morale, respect and humanity, I want to caution people very emphatically. I do not believe that inventing or devising a large number of further professorial titles for non-tenure track faculty is going to address what for me is problem number one, which is the status, the compensation, and indeed the humanity of those who currently serve as non-tenure track faculty members at Cornell, primarily in titles of lecturer and senior lecturer. Thank you very much for your indulgence."

Professor David Pelletier, Nutritional Sciences: "My mind is not quite made up on this. There are certainly parts of it that I agree with, partly because I'm a person that was in a soft-money position for ten years. Finally positions opened up for which I was appropriate, competed for, and now have that tenure track position. I also know of people who are currently affected, their competitiveness with grants, is currently affected by the fact that they don't have the kind of title that NIH is looking for as an indicator of long-term presence at Cornell in order to manage that grant. So there are aspects of this that I am definitely sympathetic to. The thing that has me troubled is the fairness one, the claim that in large part the motivation for this is fairness, and I would like to put that under a bit more inspection.

"There are a number of aspects to it. First of all, if that is what it is about, how can we justify a twenty-five percent cap? Which of the current senior lecturers or clinical staff will be enabled to have access to these new titles and which will not? You may have many of them fully qualified, but the cap is going to prevent some of them from having access to these new titles. So that seems to be a contradiction in and of itself. Secondly, if fairness is the concern, then maybe we need to broaden what is under the microscope. We currently have some people in soft money positions, and they would have titles like clinical professor and so on, who are more productive year after year than those with tenure. Now, there is an element of unfairness, and it seems to me that this proposal would only increase the extent to which that could occur within units. So if you want to do something about fairness, maybe we need to look at that kind of comparison as well. Ditto that some colleges may decide to have these titles and that's fine for the faculty in those colleges; others do not. We would be creating the potential for disparities between colleges. Ditto for the fact that this proposal was about clinical professors, the question of research professor titles will be dealt with later. If that turns out to be negative, then we have created another kind of difference. So I think there are many aspects to the unfairness that aren't consistent across the argument here. Finally, if the deans are adamant that this will not affect the number of tenure track lines on into the future, would they be willing to provide a guarantee for that, for the next twenty-five or fifty years that the number of tenure track lines will not go down. If they are not, what do we make of the promise that it won't affect the number of tenure track lines?"

Professor Bell: "I recognize Professor Gleed and then Professor Stein."

Professor Robin Gleed, Clinical Sciences: "I actually have three points to make. The first one pertains to the motivation for the adoption of clinical professors in my department. More than a third of my colleagues aren't tenure track already. They are lecturers or instructors, and several of those by virtue of their enormous contributions and reputations in our field are certainly worthy of tenure at Cornell University. This proposal is viewed as a mechanism whereby at least partially that inequity might be redressed. That's my first point. My second point really is a question to one of the previous speakers. Maybe the price for tenure and academic freedom is rigorously applied job descriptions. My third point really pertains to the two documents that we have before us for approval, two separate documents, which should be viewed separately. Quote, paraphrase of the previous speakers, and I really believe they should be viewed separately because they are almost contradictory. I quote from the global enabling legislation, 'These positions are largely single function and do not include the full range of teaching, research, extension and service associated with tenure track professional lines.' That's the first line of the third paragraph. Now to the enabling legislation of the clinical professor at the Vet School. This is the second page of that, and it is the description. 'Faculty appointed to this track will have major commitments to clinical professional service, clinical research, teaching or administrative activities. Such individuals will be expected to exhibit scholarly achievement in these areas.' Then it goes on. There is a disclaimer 'not to be associated with appointment or promotion on the tenure track.'

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I have trouble understanding the proposal. Are we just talking about adding the name professor into this title, to changing the name of senior lecturer and lecturer in this particular context,

changing that name with clinical professor? It seems to me that almost everything that can be said, that you have said, can be said about all of the lecturers and senior lecturers that we have on the campus. They are fundamentally part of our teaching program. We couldn't go on with our teaching program without them; we respect them; we want to be fair to them; we want to reward them. But I don't understand what is different about this than any of the other lecturers and senior lecturers. If so, I think I would like to have that point explicitly answered, namely why is this one different than the other non-tenure track teaching appointments that we have on campus?"

Professor Bell: "Well, if you will indulge me, I will try to do that in a minute. We considered everything that you said in that moment. As we looked at the diversity of the situations across the institution, almost every major example represented a separate case. We also, I guess, acted on the principle that for any general proposal to have some viability there would have to be some specificity, some specific recommendation from an academic unit. In this case, it happened to be the Vet College. We had hoped or had anticipated that the Vet College would simultaneously consider the clinical professor and research professor proposals. That college I think found it a sufficient challenge to consider the clinical professor title because of specific aspects of that title. I'm not sure I'm going to say any more. I'll take too much time. If another person on the task force would be willing? Abby?"

Professor Cohn: "Let me amplify that slightly. I think you can think about the substance of the proposal and then the specific title as two independent factors, as we, in fact, do. So you could consider exactly the proposal we put forward and rather than using the title of clinical professor, you could use the title clinician, for example. Indeed, as Mike pointed out, there is still substance to the proposal relative to how you appoint and renew people in those positions that is quite distinct from the current existing guidelines for lecturers. My understanding, and I could be wrong, is that the guidelines that accompany appointments and reappointment of lecturers are completely college specific and have never been subjected to the kind of scrutiny that we are now talking about even if we implement college specific proposals. What motivates us to think seriously about the specific title really is the perceived prestige both within the institution and external to the institution as it relates to competitiveness, as it relates to NIH's interpretation of what it means to be an 'X' versus a 'Y' and so on. So I think they are separate issues, and they could be considered separately."

Professor Stein: "But you could adopt these procedures independent of changing a title?"

Professor Kotlikoff: "Yes, you could. And the anticipation is that not all lecturers and senior lecturers would be immediately converted to assistant or associate or whatever professor. There will still be lecturers and senior lecturers. The idea is that these are individuals that have been recruited after a national search, subjected to that sort of level. They also are individuals who at many peer institutions, certainly not all, would be assistant professor. I chair a department that has pathology in it. These people are scarcer than hen's teeth. They can go out and make \$200,000 in industry at a minimum, and when they sit across the table from me, and I talk to them about the title lecturer or senior lecturer, a smile develops on their face. It is something that is not tenable in the culture we are speaking of in the Veterinary College. To answer your question directly^{3/4} it is not a substitution; it's not a direct conversion. There would still be lecturers and senior lecturers, but there would also be the flexibility for a title that appropriately values individuals at their level."

Professor Yrjo Grohn, Population Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences: "I support this proposal and think that it is fair, although fairness is a very complicated issue, as we have learned. But it is a very practical question. In a department like Population Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences, we have a New York State Diagnostic Laboratory as part of our department. There are many faculty members who are directors of those laboratories, and they have an extremely large service component. I feel that this clinical professorship title would allow us to hire faculty members who would support the tenure line faculty members.' In our legislation it is clearly stated that only twenty-five percent will be clinical professors. In our case, we have twenty professors, and if we were allowed to hire five new professors to our department, it would make a significant difference among those faculty members who are on a tenure line and who have an extremely large service component. Also those who will be hired, they will get the professor title, and it will help us to hire new clinical professors."

Dr.Karel (Ton) Schat, Microbiology & Immunology: "I am speaking against the enabling legislation. Alienation of tenure track faculty with tenure is based on demonstrated excellence in two of the following categories. These are research, teaching, and/or service. The document on the tenure track clinical professor appointments distributed by

the task force for the College of Veterinary Medicine lists as criteria for promotion: excellence in clinical or professional activities, applied or clinical research and in teaching. These are in essence the criteria for promotion to tenure if the individual would have been hired in a tenure track position. Are you planning to hire individuals that are expected to do tenure track work without offering tenure? Let me address the issue of clinical research. Applied or clinical research is an essential part of research, of course, at the College of Veterinary Medicine. If we don't do it, who will do it? In a college that prides itself to be the leading college of veterinary medicine in the nation, if not the world, we have to do top notch research to keep that prestige. If an individual is doing the work of a tenure track faculty member and is doing the scholarly work of a tenure track faculty member, this individual should have a tenure track position! If the individual is not fully qualified, then he or she should not be a member of the faculty.

The statement that 'non-tenure track individuals will be expected to exhibit scholarly achievement in these areas, but not to the degree associated with the appointment and promotion on the tenure track' is an incredibly negative statement. That does not belong in any appointment received at this university. Incidentally, this statement was added to the document by the task force after the College of Veterinary Medicine had voted on the document. The consequence of this statement is that it will lead to hiring individuals lacking proper credentials for a faculty member and thus a reduction in the quality education and quality research that has been associated with the College of Veterinary Medicine at Cornell University.

Professor Christine Ranney, Applied Economics and Management: "I'm still not sure where I come out on this either. I have questions, and I raise them now for those that are going to be dealing with this proposal in the Senate. It's not going to go away. We are going to have to figure out what we are going to do. My two questions are . . . It seems to me, as I read the material, that the major justification for this movement is the fact that there aren't enough tenure lines. Given that the number of tenure lines is capped, seems to be driving the entire move, OK, from the Vet School, could be other colleges. I know my college, CALS, has problems with tenure lines, too. We're shrinking; we're not growing. Now, so we are fixing the wrong problem. I think we value the work that these people do, but we don't have a tenure line to put them in. So we are in this uncomfortable place, but we are not going to fix it with this proposal. I'm really concerned about that, and I want the Senate to think about that. I understand the notion of caring about fairness very well. I think we may build in more unfairness by going forward with this. You are going to have tenured faculty doing exactly the same thing as non-tenured faculty, and that's not OK."

Professor Steven Shiffrin, Law School: "It seems to me that one of the things that should come out of this is that there should be a committee, perhaps, this one that focuses upon non-tenure track faculty in the university, that focuses on why they don't have tenure. I frankly do not understand why teaching faculty do not have tenure. They have tenure at other universities where they don't do research, and I don't understand why they don't need academic freedom. It's just a mystery to me. I understand why there is different compensation between people who occupy positions where they aren't doing fifty-percent research, but I just don't get why tenure isn't associated with it. I certainly wouldn't get any notion in which somebody, because they are in a non-tenure track position, senior lecturer, if they are doing the kind of research that ordinary professors are doing, why they wouldn't be considered for a tenured position is utterly beyond me. So there are lots of questions that people have identified, and it seems to me that they should be explored after this is dealt with. Point one.

"Point two. As I mentioned last time in the Senate, it is the case that in the Law School the driving force for this would simply be humanity. It would not be a matter of expanding positions. We have a certain number of people (in the clinic) and they are currently lecturers and senior lecturers. The overwhelming majority of the tenure and tenure track faculty are not qualified to represent live clients and to teach in the clinic; they don't have litigation experience. So it is simply a matter of calling them what they are, in fact, generally referred to clinical professor. The question in the Law School would be, 'What should the title be?' Now there are deeper questions beyond that, which I think ought to be explored. But the enabling legislation all it does is to tell the Law School, 'You can formulate a proposal. You can bring it to a committee, and the committee will decide what to do with it.' I don't

know if I'm in favor of the Vet School proposal, although I think I probably am, because it smells of trying to substitute non-tenure track positions for tenure track positions. But my guess is if it doesn't pass, they will fill those positions just with people who won't be as good, because they won't get the person who will come as a clinical professor, they will get the person who will come as a lecturer or senior lecturer, if in fact the tenure lines are capped."

And finally, to the extent they are capped, why are they capped? Are they capped for budgetary reasons? If they are capped for budgetary reasons, then one is mixing conflating compensation issues with tenure. Or is it a notion that we can't have too many people with tenure because in budget cutback times, we need to get rid of all these people. If that is the notion, it seems to me that it is way over inclusive. It can't possibly be that an administration could be that concerned about the number of cutbacks that we have to make. I've talked long enough."

Professor Normand Ducharme, Clinical Sciences: "I am in the Vet School. I am a surgeon there. I'm in favor of this proposal. There certainly are many people who don't understand why we shouldn't have more assistant professors on the tenure track, and I'll give you a surgical example and I will relate it to you. Let's say your heart has a problem. You need a bypass. Do you want a full professor that has a fifty percent research commitment, does have a research grant with NIH and does two bypass every month or do you want a clinician that does two hundred a year, is an excellent teacher; he/she knows what he's/she's doing? And whom do you want to teach your physician or your surgeon? You will get second class people if you don't give them the title that they deserve or the title that they have at competing universities. We live in a world where the med schools do that as well as other vet schools do that. If you don't have the title here, I will get it at Wisconsin or I will get it at Penn. Who are we going to keep here? Those that are satisfied with a lower title. It's not by getting more associate or assistant or full NIH professors that do great research that will add a good teaching program and have a good clinical program and have an excellent, outstanding service program as well. Thank you."

Professor Richard Hackett, Chair, Department of Clinical Sciences: "I'm Chair of the Department of Clinical Sciences, the department that seems to be generating a lot of this discussion. I am fully in favor of this proposal and for a whole variety of reasons; I won't go into all of them. The recruiting is a big issue. I have been in the unenviable situation of offering a senior lectureship to a clinical associate professor of radiology at the University of Wisconsin. I have offered a lectureship to a clinical assistant professor of cardiology at the University of Pennsylvania. We are significantly disadvantaged in recruiting."

The Department of Clinical Sciences - most of the operation of the hospital program is done by members of my department. We have right now sixteen clinical specialties represented, ranging from dermatology to oncology to large animal surgery to ophthalmology. The hospital is open twenty-four seven three hundred and sixty-five days a year. The number of faculty in tenure track that I have as a department chair to maintain the operation of the hospital, to train veterinary students while they are working in the hospital, to train residents, has been in the mid-30's. It has been in the mid-30's since at least 1985. When I became chair in 1999, the number of faculty working on the floor of the hospital that we had at that time was lower than it had been in 1985, in spite of a hospital case load that has crept up virtually every year since that time and the addition of new clinical specialties during that interval. I sat down and looked at staffing in the department to address hospital staffing, first of all, and came up with a list of nineteen positions. It became very clear that we were not going to get nineteen new tenure lines in the Department of Clinical Sciences, and I have recruited a large number of clinical individuals who are outstanding individuals. They are very well trained, and in my opinion, the Vet School, without them, would be a second-class institution. We need to have a clinical facility that is appropriately staffed, that outstanding individuals are rendering service, bringing students and residents, and we have these people here now. Not at the expense of the tenured faculty, but to supplement the tenured faculty, and I feel that we are doing them a great disservice in the title that we have applied to them because of our current limitations."

Professor Ronald Booker, Neurobiology and Behavior: "When I first heard this proposal I thought, and I still do believe, that this is a very complex issue. In some ways it is sort of confounded by the management needs of the Vet School. To be honest, just based on that description there, we can see that something has happened at the Vet School, and it needs to be addressed. Whether or not this is the appropriate way of doing it or not, that's another issue. I mean that's a management issue. The Vet School built a new building, expanded its clinical services, but yet had a fixed number of tenure track lines that it could allocate to its departments. How is it going to fix that

problem? I don't know.

The real problem we have here that adds yet another question, 'Are we treating people who are senior extension associates, senior lecturers, senior research associates fairly?' I know some of my colleagues in Arts and Sciences, say, 'This is not our problem. I'm in Philosophy. We don't have people in that position.' But the reality is that even in Arts and Sciences when you go to the Biological Sciences, a lot of the experimental areas, like the sciences, you find people that are actually sitting with titles such as senior research associates or even senior lecturers. And the question we should really be asking of those individuals is, 'Are you happy?' We see ourselves protecting tenure, because we want to have academic freedom, but in a way we also have to ask, 'What is the status of those individuals and do they really feel that they are being protected? Do they have the same rights as we do in this academy at this point in time?' I think the answer to that is no. Is it an easy fix? The answer is no.

"In a way, I am afraid with the proposal that we are trying again . . . you know, there is a lot of compromise. You look at the language and this is all really a series of compromises from my point of view, because there is some concern about whether or not we would accept this sort of new radical change in terms of how we define what a professor is. I think if we act too quickly, we may actually miss some of the important points that are relevant to this issue. What do we do with individuals who are wholly dissatisfied with their position? For instance, if you are a senior research associate and you hold that position, and let's say you are a captive spouse in Ithaca at Cornell, you may not even be eligible to apply to some granting agencies. Is that fair? These individuals have come here to serve this community, but yet they find that they have sort of locked themselves into the position where they can't be equal even when maybe in terms of their scholarship, they are just as good as you or I. So we need to really look at this very carefully, and sort of separate this issue from what is going on in the Vet College in terms of their management issues, in terms of their funding lines and the number of positions they have relative to the services they must provide. To me that causes some confusion."

Carol Grumbach, Senior Lecturer, Law School: "I'm one of these people that Steve alluded to. I actually practice law and because of that I cannot have the title of professor, so I'm a senior lecturer at the Law School. I want to speak to a few points, all very briefly. First, I agree with the previous speaker that there are a lot of fairness issues and changing the title is not enough. However, I will tell you that in the Law School it will be an extraordinary, large step to improving our sense of dignity.

"As far as the other points that have come up - this is just a way creating a larger pink-collar ghetto. I know the speaker didn't use that point, but that is essentially what they were saying. Let me make clear that we are already a pink-collar ghetto at the Law School. There are twenty-eight tenure track faculty members; twenty-six of them already have tenure. Only six of them are women. With the senior lecturer and lecturer category, there are ten of us and six of us are women. So that's a problem and there are a lot of issues, but as I say, by denying the enabling legislation because there are more and deeper and broader issues, that will not change the look of the Law School. So I think this is a small step, maybe not as big a step as necessary, but a small step that will improve our situation a lot. It's not a management issue at the Law School. It is a fairness issue. The Law School has five open tenure track lines that they can hire for, and this will not impact that at all. There will be some effect on competitiveness. We are all hired, the senior lecturers and lecturers, after a national job search. For the live client clinic we are the only Law School in New York that doesn't grant clinical professor title, and that is a problem."

Professor Robert Gilbert, Associate Dean, Clinical Programs and Professional Service, Veterinary Medicine: "That debate is a complicated one. Most of the points that have been debated and we have heard both sides of the issue. I would like to add a few comments on the gender question in particular. That is complicated, and it is difficult to address the issue without appearing to be unfeeling towards it, so at the outset, I will recognize and stipulate that there are gender issues in hiring in academia. They are certainly well documented in academic medicine, and although not as well documented they are probably as prevalent in academic veterinary medicine. So the issue is an important one, and I don't wish to deny that or minimize it, only to claim that in the context of this discussion, the gender issue is a distracter or a red herring.

It's not relevant, and hopefully not in the terms that 'it's already a pink-collar ghetto, so it doesn't matter.' We will be hiring individuals in non-tenure positions in the future whether or not we are able to offer them the title of professor. If we aren't able to offer the title - all that offers is an enhanced scrutiny, an enhanced competitive status and I think greater involvement not less involvement of their colleagues in making this search. I don't think it alters

the gender balance one way or the other.

"The second reason that I think that it is a distraction for this debate is that it rests somewhat on the assumption that the tenure system is itself a gender neutral or a gender fair one. I personally would contest that quite vigorously and argue that the tenure system is unfriendly to women. It is a complicated issue and an important issue, but in the context of this debate I think it is nothing more than a distraction."

Professor Bell: "Thank you. We have time for two, perhaps three, more comments. Professor Fine."

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "I have to take another side, maybe an unpleasant side of the fairness issue^¾ fairness to the title. I gather that the title of professor at least in this room, not everywhere in the world, is considered complementary. Here it is a good thing. It brings a smile to the face of somebody making \$200,000 a year if he can get that title. And the reason it brings a smile is because there is a fairly strong process by which it is awarded. I think most of us are familiar with that. Does the process make mistakes? Of course it does. We probably think we are surrounded by the mistakes. [LAUGHTER.] The process is a pretty careful one, which is what I think has gone into the making of the meaning behind that title professor. So I don't think it's a question of fairness that one just gives it out. It might be generous, but I don't think it is a matter of fairness. I think it would be unfair to give it to people who have not gone through the same process, who have not met the same standards.

"Let me bring up another thing. What bothers me even more than that, actually, and it's something alluded to by Professor Shiffirin, the issue of why aren't there more tenured faculty, why do we have all these people serving in these other roles? I have not thought this one through, and I think it needs thinking through. It apparently is possible to have a cap on tenured faculty and yet have a good number of clinical faculty. Somehow you can find room for that. Some of that might be soft money; some of that might be dependent on the number of students. I don't know. But clearly there is a great plus administratively to having the flexibility, as seen from that point of view, of people to whom you do not have long term career commitments to. What I see and hear here is not just an occasional adjustment of something but the creation of an alternate faculty. We will have the full range of ranks. There will be assistant, associate, full; it will go here and it will go there; it will have the word clinical before or clinical after; it will have research here or there. We will move it to an asterisk; we'll drop the asterisk. There is a desire to create a kind of parallel here. What is the advantage of that?

"From where I sit, it is not an advantage, but I think it is an advantage if you look at it from the point of view of running the budget of this school, of making long-term commitments and of having control. Now it's true, Dean Smith, I think, was said to have put a cap on the number of twenty-five percent, and the same dean giveth and taketh away. What stops him from changing that? That is not something that is going to be legislated. If you trust him to hold that, somebody else said, 'What's going to happen twenty years from now?' All right. Believe me you are not going to take that to the bank for twenty years. So I really think that that is a long-term issue. Perhaps you need more tenure lines to meet some of your needs. And the other thing is this issue about multi-function and single function. But I'll stop here."

Professor Stephen Barr, Clinical Sciences: "I guess there are a couple of issues that I just want to bring up here, and that is the issue of humanity. If you read these documents, as Dr. Gleed pointed out, they tell us that these people will be expected to do many of the things that tenured faculty do now. To do that to them, or expect them to do that and hold them to that, and not give them tenure is inhumane. That is not humanity. So don't talk to me about these positions being humane. They are not at all. If I wanted to stand up here and say that the administration of the Veterinary College is corrupt, I could do it, because I am a tenured faculty member. And that is academic freedom. I would doubt that anybody in this position, calling himself or herself professor without tenure, would have the gall, let alone the stupidity, to criticize this college.

"The other point I want to make is that if you read these two documents, which have been changed between what was at the Vet School and what was here, you will still see that what these people are required to do, clinical research albeit, not NIH research, bench research per se, that they will be expected to do clinical research and publish that research. They will be expected to be teaching and do service to clients, be excellent clinicians, putting in heart valves, and sit on committees. As far as I'm concerned that's tenurable. It is not a single entity that they are

expected to do. They are not expected just to see cases and gladly go home at night and collect their \$200,000. No way. They are expected to be scholarly. If you are going to put the title of professor on them, they have to be scholarly at Cornell University. The Provost has said that; I say that. I think everybody here would expect that, especially in a world class veterinary college. If they are going to be scholarly, they should be tenurable. So we go back to this whole point of what is tenure at Cornell University? These people are exceptional. There are many of them in this room. We value them highly. It's inhumane to suggest that they are not worthy of tenure. So that is where humanity comes in."

Professor Dorothy Ainsworth, Clinical Science: "I must agree with Steve on several of his points. To have a person put into a clinical track appointment that has a seventy percent commitment to clinic, which means eight months approximately of clinical duty, and then expect them to be publishing and advancing the knowledge of veterinary medicine in their two months off clinic, when you consider that most clinicians spend seven days a week from 8:00 a.m. until 8:00 p.m. in the clinic, it's inhumane. It can't be done. I do not support this position."

Professor Sharon Center, Clinical Sciences: "I am one of the clinicians at the Veterinary College. I have been there for twenty years. One of the things that bothers me about this issue is that, yes, it is very complex, but when I heard it discussed at the Veterinary College and, with all respect to Dr. Kotlikoff, the research that I have done is not molecular science, it's very well founded veterinary clinical research, and I am known nationally and internationally and I am worthy of tenure and so are many of these individuals that we are talking about putting in these positions that we suggest that their research is not rigorous enough to be worthy of tenure at Cornell University. I think that is terribly misleading about our department, and it's a little offensive. Thank you."

Professor Bell: "Thank you all. I hope this has been helpful and illuminating."