

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE**  
**Wednesday, March 12, 2003**

Professor Howard Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior and Speaker: "I would like to remind everyone that no photos or tape recorders are allowed during the meeting. I would like to ask everyone to identify themselves and their department when they speak. Please turn off your cell phones. We have no Good and Welfare speakers today, and you may have noticed that the agenda is shorter than usual. As Provost Martin is not here. I will start by calling on Dean Cooke for remarks."

**1. REMARKS BY DEAN J. ROBERT COOKE**

J. Robert Cooke, Dean of the University Faculty: "I have two fairly short updates. The first is that there is a discussion in process of Life Sciences Strategic Corporate Alliances. The administrative principles involved in the development of this are not available either today or next month at the Senate meeting. So that we have some general faculty means for input, I have asked the Local Advisory Council, which normally reviews grant proposals, (so it's a collection of individuals who have considerable experience in the area of funding for research) to look at it. Because of the time pressures, I'm suggesting that if they find nothing of any serious concern to the faculty that they would report that to the UFC, and that would be the end of it. If, on the other hand, they find issues that require your attention, then we would bring it here in May. Should you wish to interact with this group, here is the membership of that standing committee (Joseph Burns, Thomas O'Rourke, Martha Haynes, Hector Abruna, Paul Houston, Michael Kotlikoff, John Lis, Molly Jahn, Cutberto Garza). Robert Buhrman is the Chair. I'm sure they would welcome your input; they have just received the proposal, and I will keep you informed as this moves along.

"I have a very quick informational update on the Scholarly Publishing Project. Remember that we are proceeding in two parts. One is creating a digital repository that is being operated by the library, and this is a place for storing resources that are to be shared with the faculty, students, staff and the rest of the world. It can be multi-media; it can be data from experiments; it can be a number of informal kinds of materials that the faculty need to communicate with each other. If you publish a paper, you could put the massive raw data sets in this collection and refer to the address in your paper. We have a few things that are far enough along that I can report on. The Johnson Art Museum has already created about 18,000 images of its art collection and will be doing more. They have volunteered to put these on the digital repository and make them available to you. The Cornell Plantations has a new research project, in which they are

going to photograph every specie of plant in the Plantations' collection for the four seasons, and they will post this and make it available to the world. There are other projects, and I want to remind you of this so that if you have other potential projects that you think we ought to be focusing on, I would be delighted to hear from you.

"We have some other things of a more formal nature that are moving along. One is that the faculty in the humanities have been faced with a considerable predicament concerning books they publish through university presses. They are being constrained now because the university presses have a financial burden to deal with, so there is greater pressure to publish things that have a commercial aspect to them in order to preserve their bottom line. We are proposing that one of the possibilities to overcome this would be to publish it on the DSpace in digital form, provide on-demand print copies, so that if you want a copy you can print it at low cost, and yet would not foreclose the possibility of publishing in the more traditional ways. Submissions would be reviewed by the press and meet the same standards, so that you would not be entitled to publish there automatically. It would still have to undergo the normal review process, and it would carry the university presses' imprint. That is in the early stage, but it looks like we have interest in pursuing it.

We are also interested in providing on-demand printing for existing journals. We are having conversations with the *Philosophical Review*, which has been published by the Philosophy faculty for over one hundred years, and we are hopeful that we can reduce their costs. We have conversations with the Graduate School and have gotten permission to post dissertations and theses."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you. I would like to call now on Provost Martin. Provost Martin has to leave shortly after these remarks."

## **2. REMARKS BY AND QUESTIONS FOR PROVOST BIDDY MARTIN**

Provost Biddy Martin: "Yes, I apologize for that. Since there was limited time, I thought that I should take questions from you. If you don't have any, I'll make some remarks."

Speaker Howland: "Any questions for the Provost?"

Professor Terrence Fine, Electrical and Computer Engineering: "The admissions process that has gained such notoriety?"

Provost Martin: "You mean the admissions mistake? What would you like to ask, Terry?"

Professor Fine: "I'm sure you have something to say about that."

Provost Martin: "What I have to say about that is that I think it is a horrible thing for the young people, given all the stresses of applying to colleges and waiting to hear whether you are going to be accepted, and especially given that these were students who had Cornell as their first choice, because they were early decision applicants. I feel especially badly about it. I think that it was handled as well as it could be handled in the aftermath of a mistake of that sort. I have asked the head of Admissions to send out a letter on letterhead of apology to all of the 550 students to supplement what was e-mailed. But it was human error; someone typed in the wrong code and ended up having the longer list instead of the list only of accepted students go out. I'm sure that Doris Davis and her staff are doing everything necessary to ensure that it doesn't happen again. It's too bad; we got a lot of press for it. I don't really believe the adage that it's better to have some press than none."

Professor Brad Anton, Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering: "Can you report on the Dean search for the College of Arts and Sciences?"

Provost Martin: "The Dean search for the College of Arts and Sciences is in its final phases. We have announced the four finalists, and their names and curriculum vitas are on the Provost's web page, a web page that I'm sure you have bookmarked and visit frequently. But in case you don't, you can find it easily by hitting 'provost.cornell.edu'. They will be coming to campus in a very narrow window, actually at least three of them will. The week after spring break, starting on Sunday evening, we will have three people here between Sunday and Wednesday, and the reason for that is a combination of their schedules and that fact that Jeff Lehman can only be here on Sunday and Monday of that week, and we are trying to get three people in to meet him while he is here. We expect that the visits will be done by April 2. The search committee will meet as soon as we have gotten feedback from the faculty, who will have a chance to meet all the candidates. Once we have your feedback, the search committee will then submit a list of candidates they deem acceptable to the Presidents (plural). We hope that we will have a new Dean in the first two weeks of April.

"There is also a search underway for a new Dean of the Law School, as many of you know. That search committee has been meeting weekly for about three weeks. We already have a relatively long list of internal and external candidates, and we will be proceeding through the summer and hope to have a new Dean by

January 2004 or July 1, 2004. We will be starting the search for a new dean of Architecture, Art and Planning, once I have finished with Arts and Sciences.”

Professor Subrata Mukherjee, Theoretical and Applied Mechanics: “I am just wondering – the finalists are all external – but did you find any internal candidates before that didn’t make it to the final list?”

Provost Martin: “Yes, there were internal and external candidates. The search committee is a rather large one. It’s made up of thirteen faculty members from Arts and Sciences; it’s a great committee. It has met at least once a week and sometimes more frequently since early September. After very serious deliberations about what would be best for the college and what the various profiles were of the different candidates, that group decided to go with the external group of four.”

Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior: “I wonder if you would be willing to say a word or two about the financial situation, particularly in the statutory colleges. What is the current dismal view?”

Provost Martin: “Well, the current view is that it is dismal. I’m just kidding. You have to be able to joke in hard times, they say. The state’s budget situation is looking worse and worse. Many of the members of the administration were in Albany yesterday. Things are looking worse rather than better from the state front. What does that mean for SUNY and therefore for Cornell? We won’t know for a long time, and that’s of course the problem in New York State. We probably won’t have state budget until sometime in the summer, if then. Therefore we won’t know how bad things look. We are doing a lot of lobbying directly with the state, the governor’s office, the senate, and the legislators, as well as with SUNY. But, there will definitely be cuts and the question is only how big they will be, what the magnitude of the cuts will be. That’s on the contract side. Of course, if student aid is not restored to the state budget, that will mean that on the endowed side we will have to provide more financial aid funds, and that will therefore affect the budgets on the endowed side as well. So it will affect everyone.

“On the endowed side, things are going to be tight for the next few years certainly. None of us obviously knows exactly what is going to happen in the next few months economically or militarily, so it is extremely hard to say how long this climate of constraint and limitation will last on either side. I would say, even on the endowed side, we are going to be constrained for certainly a few years. We are going to have faculty salary programs. We are not dropping our faculty salary goals. There will be differentiation across colleges in the amount of the increases. That’s based not simply on the availability of funding but also

on market data that shows which colleges are closest to reaching market. We will have a staff salary increase program as well, but it will probably be a little lower than we had hoped. We have modeled into the future to satisfy ourselves that we are not renegeing on our commitment to increasing faculty salaries to reach the median of our peers. We might just reach it by a different route but within the same amount of time. We are actually doing, as you all know, quite well. On the contract college side, we are getting so close to meeting the goal even after two or three years of our faculty salary commitment, that we'll probably reach that goal in fewer than the number of years we set out to reach it. On the endowed side, it is harder to reach our goal, because of the peers who are just ahead us. In absolute dollars we are doing much better and even in the percent difference, but it's hard to overtake Columbia."

Professor Steven Shiffrin, Law School: "I'm curious as to whether you know if the admissions people have yet designed the application for the fall. The Law School just recently determined to change the language of its admissions form so that whatever the court did, there will be useable information. I'm talking, for example, of asking about diversity but without mentioning race in the application, talking about discrimination and hurdles that the candidate might have had to overcome without mentioning race in the application. I'm just curious if they have focused on what they are doing with wording the application."

Provost Martin: "I think they are doing what you can imagine all admissions offices are doing and that is trying to anticipate a number of different possible outcomes and be prepared for any number of them. There has been no official change in the form based on some assumed outcome as yet, nor will there necessarily be a change. None of us will know probably until June or July I would guess."

Professor Shiffrin: "I'm just suggesting that it would possible to change the form without changing the admissions policy. One that would allow you to implement the prior policy without having a form that would not obviously contradict what the court ruled. The court would be unlikely to say that you can't take a personal view into account of discrimination or anecdotes of that kind."

Provost Martin: "There will have to be some creative ways to deal with whatever the Supreme Court decides without being unlawful."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Provost Martin."

Provost Martin: "You're welcome. I'm sorry I have to leave."

### **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 12, 2003 SENATE MEETING**

Speaker Howland: "I would like now to call for approval of the minutes of February 12 of the Faculty Senate Meeting. I ask for unanimous approval. Hearing no objections, the minutes are approved. I would like now to call on Associate Dean and Secretary Charles Walcott for a Nominations and Elections Committee report.

### **4. REPORT FROM THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE**

Professor Charles Walcott, Neurobiology and Behavior and Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty: "I usually at this time have an overhead to present to you and flash past. I don't this time, and it's not from lack of activity in Nominations and Elections; it's just that nothing fits under this particular cycle. I would like to take my two minutes, however, to urge you, when you get as you will very shortly a canvas for candidates for all the various and assorted committees, to please look it over and give us suggestions and help. Nominations and Elections meets, and we are faced with this great blank slate. We are desperate to find people we can recommend for all these various committees. We would greatly welcome self-nominations or suggestions of people who you think might fit and be appropriate for all the various committees. In addition to that, we are going to need to replace our distinguished speaker. Professor Howland has said that he does not wish to continue in this role, so we need to find somebody else. Suggestions would be most welcome. And my term as Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty also ceases on June 30, so we are going to need to find someone for that position. Again, suggestions are most welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Howland: "Thank you, Professor Walcott. I would like now to call on Dean Cooke for the Dean of Faculty election results."

### **5. DEAN OF FACULTY ELECTION RESULTS**

Dean Cooke: "On behalf of the Nominations and Elections Committee I wish to report the result of the balloting that we have just completed and invite you to join me in congratulating our new Dean of the Faculty - Charles Walcott."  
APPLAUSE.

Speaker Howland: "The chair will recognize the dean-elect if he would like to make a few remarks."

Professor Charles Walcott: "I would simply like to say that I am deeply honored by this election. I feel that the former deans, here present, have set an example of open-mindedness, of a judicious frame of mind, and in my opinion have done a wonderful job as deans of the faculty, and I hope very much that I can live up somewhat to the standard they have set. I look forward very much to working with all of you. Thank you."

APPLAUSE.

Speaker Howland: "I would like now to call on the Co-Chairs of the Committee on the Status of Non-tenure-track Faculty. Professor Norm Scott is not here, but I believe that Professor Emeritus Donald Holcomb will make the report.

## **6. UPDATE BY THE COMMITTEE ON STATUS OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

Professor Emeritus, Donald Holcomb, Physics and Co-Chair, Committee on Status of Non-tenure-track Faculty: "First I should say that my co-chair, Norm Scott, sends his apologies. It turns out that he had a previous commitment for giving a talk to a group and thought that he had better be there. So I will simply have to take both ends of it. I had actually been planning at the time of questions later on to take notes if some important matters come up. I see at least two of my colleagues on the committee here. Steve and Stuart, I hope if there are important questions that you will help me remember them at the next meeting.

"It seemed like a good idea to first remind the Faculty Senate of what you did last fall (October 9, 2002) and that is to direct the Dean of Faculty to appoint a task force basically to investigate various aspects of non-tenure-track faculty. We have tried to take seriously a wish list of things this committee might investigate, and I'll return to that a bit later with some slight expansion or in some cases some wording changes which seemed to us to make sense with respect to pursuing some of these tasks.

"Part C of your resolution last fall was that this committee should report to the Senate on the progress no later than the second Senate meeting of the spring, (and that's today) but may report earlier if any specific proposals are ready for action. That was a fabulously optimistic phrase, since the charge to this committee, in fact as we talked about it, we realized extends to a huge range of policy issues surrounding many groups of faculty numbering somewhere

between 1000 and 1500. So this is a big job, and the committee will undoubtedly have a report later in the spring, but what it will consist of, we don't know yet. My remarks won't be more than six or eight minutes, and there will be plenty of time for questions, and we can still leave early.

"Here is the membership of the committee. I will give you a moment to go down through. You will either know names, or you can read the origins of this committee of substantial size.

**Committee on Status of Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

**Lynne Abel**

*Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences*

**Stuart A. Davis**

*Senior Lecturer in English*

**Donald F Holcomb, (co-chair)**

*Prof. of Physics Emeritus*

**Linda Van Buskirk**

*Senior Lecturer in Communication*

**Mary George Opperman**

*Vice President, Human Resources*

**Donald A.. Rutz**

*Professor of Entomology*

**Norman R. Scott (co-chair)**

*Professor of Biological and Environmental Engineering*

**Steven H. Shiffrin**

*Professor of Law*

**Susan J. Steward**

*Director, Office of Academic Personnel Policy*

**Maria Terrell**

*Senior Lecturer in Mathematics*

**Pamela S. Tolbert**

*Professor of Organizational Behavior, ILR*

**Nancy I. Wurster**

*Senior Research Associate in Veterinary Medicine*

Dean Cooke put this committee together, and it ended up being a substantial size because of the need to really get quite a number of different viewpoints into the considerations. If you look at it, you will find that it is a mix of faculty people, members of the University Faculty with a capital 'F', a number of senior lecturers and senior research associates and then several absolutely invaluable administrative people. Mary Opperman, Vice President for Human Resources, and Susan Steward, Director of the Office of Academic Personnel Policy, are absolutely essential, because we find ourselves already ranging over many issues having to do with personnel matters, appointments, you name it. Down at the bottom is one of the really important members of our committee and that is its web site (<http://instruct1.cit.cornell.edu/~sad4/NTTF/>). We have relied on a high-tech proficient member of our committee from the English Department, namely Stuart Davis who has set up a web site. On that web site you will find some documents and also links to many, many different places, and that web site and its links will only grow with time. I'm sure those of you who have particular interests will be able to find interesting documents thereon. If anybody is interested in that and hasn't written it down, Stuart can give it to you any time.

"Up at the top is a question which we needed to ask ourselves right away, the answer to which was not immediately obvious from the instructions in the resolution. (Appendix 1). The term faculty, for one thing, has both a capitalized version and a small letter version. The capitalized version is essentially the group that is represented in this Senate, the University Faculty. But, in fact, the motion clearly intended the term to include those folks who many outsiders would imagine to be members of the faculty, namely employees engaged in the various aspects of the teaching and research program. It seemed better to us to start with a list of those groups of people that are called academic appointments, and here it is. You will find this list of those positions, which are included as academic appointments, in the *Faculty Handbook*. Of course there are the people with the title professor. That number, roughly 1600, was my guess; it's by no means accurate. Then the positions of senior scholar and senior scientist established some years ago, of which it turns out, that according to our records, there are only four at the moment. You can go down through the list.

"For several reasons we thought that we could make most progress if we imagined a restricted group from this list for our first cut through, and that is the group in the green box. These are the lecturers and senior lecturers, research associates and senior research associates and similar for extension associates. The two numbers there in succession represent the number of senior members in that category and the other group. Within that green box there are approximately 1000 people, so that we are in fact talking about a substantial

chunk of this university's teaching and research community. We chose to restrict ourselves partly because it is a huge group, and partly because it seemed to us that there are some issues there that are more or less common to those groups. Some of these groups have very special circumstances surrounding their duties, and we felt it was wise to begin with a group with which we had some chance constraining the considerations.

"The other important group down at the bottom – librarians and archivists. We found that group already has rather more clear cut policies and procedures for handling some of the matters that are under our purview, but most importantly it is just a very different group than the group within the green box.

"I will just talk a little bit about where we are and then open the floor to any questions that people might have. These are the study areas that are taken almost directly from the instructions in the faculty resolution.

#### **STUDY AREAS OF COMMITTEE ON NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

- **Terms of appointment, performance review, notice, safety nets, "job security"**
- **Rights to academic freedom**
- **Knowledgeability about and access to appropriate appeals and grievance procedures**
- **Professional development** -- opportunities for appropriate leaves, conferences and workshops, opportunities for consulting activities
- **Voting Rights**
- **Titles**
- **Emeritus/a status** -- use of title, support for post-retirement professional activities, Non-\$ retirement benefits

---

There are, I think, seven of these. They are broken up slightly differently and there is slightly different terminology that seemed to us to more accurately guide our work as we go along. The top one you can read for yourself and see its meaning. Number two, rights to academic freedom, is obviously an important issue. It is of course immediately somewhat different for the non-tenure people, because there has been such a tight link between academic freedom and tenure. So we need to look at that afresh. I found it interesting to look at a report of a committee that I think was chaired by one these standard committee chairs, Bill Bowen from Princeton or somebody like that, and looked at this academic freedom issue a few years ago. And there is an interesting sentence in the middle of the report where it says effectively, 'Somebody ought to look at the issues of academic freedom for non-tenured faculty.' That was their solution for the moment. Well, we are going to try and look at it. Of course the third one is more or less self-explanatory. In the original faculty resolution used the phrase sabbatical leave. It seemed to us that made a lot more sense after we had drawn that into a phrase of opportunities for professional development, which can include appropriate leaves of absence, conferences and workshops, opportunities for consulting, so we really in that case felt it appropriate to broaden that original description. Voting rights is self-explanatory, titles, and then the last one emeritus status. In this case, again, we want to broaden it beyond that specific phrase of emeritus, because what we are really talking about is post-retirement professional activities or their non-dollar retirement benefits. We will probably be guided there by the present policy for emeritus faculty, which has a long list of what is provided for such people.

"This is where we are right now.

**Steps: -- Get background materials**

**-- Examine college/other unit differences**

**-- Summarize gaps/critical issues**

**-- Recommendations**

The steps that we imagine as we have actually broken our group up. Our group was large enough so that we actually have seven little, tiny sub-groups that are looking at these different areas, and we are just getting going. We imagine going through the steps at the bottom and pulling together all the background

materials, examining college differences or other units. Fortunately, those differences seem to be in the fine print rather than in the basic – particularly for those colleges that have large components of our initial target group. We are going to be looking for gaps or critical issues in those different areas and then ultimately move to recommendations. I should say that as we get to the recommendations phase, I personally will retreat more into the background. It seems to be inappropriate for an emeritus professor to be sitting around trying to decide the future of the faculty; therefore my colleagues will come more into the foreground. So that's it. I would be glad to answer any questions. There are several colleagues here."

Speaker Howland: "Do you want to field your own questions?"

Professor Emeritus Holcomb: "Yes."

Professor Stephen Vavasis, Computer Science: "Are you planning to compare Cornell to other universities?"

Professor Holcomb: "The question was whether we plan to compare the situation here at Cornell to other universities. The answer is certainly yes. In particular, if you think of an area like academic freedom, we will be very much interested in how other institutions may have handled this situation. It's clear that there will be only a certain amount of that possible. I think you can understand why because of the total available time. On the other hand, we certainly intend to use all of that."

Professor Rebecca Schneider, Natural Resources: "Are you only looking at official policies of colleges and departments or have you considered doing a survey to get at what actually happens in practice by getting some feedback from the different elements of that group?"

Professor Holcomb: "I think the answer is yes. One thing that we are trying to get under way now is an on-line forum. That is going to be on the air within a short period of time. We have talked about – in fact Steve Shiffrin may have made the suggestion – that we have some hearings available. The answer is certainly one needs to know what is happening out there, not just what is written down on pieces of paper."

Professor Peter Stein, Physics: "I have two questions: A trivial one which I am asking jointly with my colleague, Professor Fine, and a big one. The trivial one – we can only count three professorial titles and you had six. Could you explain that?"

Professor Holcomb: "If I had my *Faculty Handbook* I think I could."

Professor Stein: "Do you want me to give you the three?"

Professor Holcomb: "Yes, go ahead and give me the three."

Professor Stein: "Assistant, Associate and Full."

Professor Holcomb and others: "Visiting, Adjunct, Courtesy. There are probably more than six, actually."

Professor Stein: "Now the serious question. This notion of the rights to academic freedom – that is such a broad question, I wouldn't even know how to get a handle on it. In particular, are there extent complaints about the violation of academic freedom on the part of non-tenure-track faculty or are these only sort of hypothetical, theoretical arguments that people make? Is there really a problem?"

Professor Holcomb: "I do not know. In the debate at the time this committee was set up was there any suggestion that such might exist? The group that is looking at that will certainly want to find out what the local situation is."

Professor Risa Lieberwitz, Industrial and Labor Relations: "Just in terms of addressing what Peter raised about academic freedom, perhaps it would be helpful just to put it out there. It seems to me that one of the issues that your committee will look at is not only the question of whether there are actual complaints or, as Peter put, a theory, but also the way in which in practice there is self-censure that goes on because of the feeling of vulnerability."

Professor Holcomb: "It may well be that in response to that the committee may recommend some rather forthright attempt to set down some sort of guidelines or what have you."

Professor Lieberwitz: "It seems to me that the link, if you just follow the link that you raised between academic freedom and job security, that historically it was there for a reason. People feel more comfortable in speaking in classrooms or in their research or just generally publicly if they feel secure in their jobs. So I would assume that one of the things that your committee will look at is increasing job security and questions about historically why non-tenure-track faculty do not have job security of the kind that tenure-track faculty do or at least tenured faculty do and possibly make recommendations toward that end of increasing job security. Do you think you have some time to talk about that?"

Professor Holcomb: "I think what you have said is the central issue, really, and that is that without the protection of tenure, then it is a different playing field. That group is going to be looking at that central question."

Professor Linda Rayor, Entomology: "I'm a non-tenure-track assistant professor. Where are you placing people like me in this categorization?"

Professor Holcomb: "In the middle of it. We decided to begin with this group of 1000 people that we felt that were in categories that had enough regularity and similarity and large numbers that we would, in some sense, cut our teeth on that group."

Professor Rayor: "So I would be in the category of assistant professors or would I be in the senior lecturer category?"

Professor Holcomb: "No, you would be in the professorial category. It's just that we decided to begin with another group."

Professor Rayor: "My other question is—I've been looking over the enabling legislation for clinical professor title, so I might be a little bit out of date, but it looks like one of the goals of this is to have specific deadlines for the tenure of these positions of four to five years. How much is this being discussed?"

Professor Holcomb: "As far as I know that is not in the bailiwick of this committee."

Dean Cooke: "The clinical professor title? We provided the enabling legislation. It was sent to the Trustees; they approved it. We are now waiting for a college to come forth with a particular plan, which then will be reviewed by the Senate. We have no proposals from a college at this point."

Professor Ron Ehrenberg, Industrial and Labor Relations and Economics: "In my role as chair of the AAUP Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession, this is an issue that we are very much concerned about, and we at the AAUP are very much concerned about both non-tenure-track full-time faculty and also the role of adjunct faculty. I think it would be very useful to the committee in its report just to break out the data. Although I saw the lecturers in the slide you put up, I didn't see the non-tenure-track assistant professors, and I have no sense of the size or the usage of part-time and adjunct faculty at Cornell. It may be that we are relatively immune to that problem because of our unique location and that for us it is a benefit rather than a cost of having part-time adjunct faculty, but I think it would be really useful for the faculty to know what those numbers are."

Professor Holcomb: "I think the only thing I can say is that we are going to start with this group and from that I think we will learn something about the scope and what we can handle. Surely this and the issue about the non-tenure assistant professors are obviously central. Although this group is surely not going to enter into a review of the tenure process. That is another huge segment, and there are only so many things that even a group as large as this one can handle. The details of the tenuring process I am guessing . . . but, you know, it may turn out that if other people on the committee decide it's sufficiently important then we'll look at it."

Speaker Howland: "Additional question or comments for Professor Holcomb?"

Stuart Davis, English: "I'm a member of the committee. I'm not a member of the faculty. In response to Professor Rayor and Professor Ehrenberg's remarks, there was no desire to suppress the attention to non-tenure-track professorial faculty. We are aware of their existence, and they are not going to be put on the back burner. They are part of the design.. It's my understanding, but I would like to just confirm Professor Ehrenberg's suggestion that it would be good to have some raw data about the numbers - on matters of age and gender, as well as some other titular appointments, so I think that would be very much on our minds.

Professor Holcomb: "The committee will certainly welcome input of any sort from any direction, and we'll try to figure out what to do with it."

Speaker Howland: "Additional questions? Seeing none, thank you, Professor Holcomb. We reach now Good and Welfare, but nobody registered to speak for Good and Welfare, so the chair will entertain a motion for adjournment."

Meeting adjourned 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Walcott, Associate Dean and Secretary

**Appendix 1**University Faculty? faculty? "Academic Appointments"?**Academic titles:**

Professors (six sub-classifications)	~1600
Senior Scholar, Senior Scientist	4
Instructor	19
<b>Senior Lecturer, Lecturer</b>	<b>160 150</b>
<b>Senior Research Associate, Research Associate</b>	<b>163 244</b>
<b>Senior Extension Associate, Extension Associate</b>	<b>172 116</b>
Postdoctoral Associate/Fellow	351
Teaching Associate	27
Visiting Fellow, Critic, Scientist, Scholar	
Librarians and Archivists (eleven sub-classifications)	133