

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, May 8, 1996

The Speaker, Professor S. Kay Obendorf, Textiles and Apparel, called the meeting to order. She then called on Dean Stein for remarks.

1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Peter C. Stein, Dean of Faculty: "This is my usual role of ensuring that the meeting starts at 4:30, even though there is still a good number of people outside signing in. On this occasion, we do have a full agenda, so I would like to cede my time for making remarks to one of our Faculty Trustees, Joe Calvo. As you know, we have two Faculty Trustees, the other being Dick Schuler; and we're now in the process of selecting a replacement for Joe. Joe has been a Faculty Trustee for four years now, and I'd just like to say a few words about him.

"There's a phrase that kind of warms my heart that has fallen into disuse and has been debased; the phrase I like is 'public servant.' Every politician calls him- or herself a public servant, and very few are. But it's a nice phrase, and it indicates someone who really desires to serve the community that has selected him or her. Joe, to me, is a perfect example of that phrase, 'public servant.' He is indefatigable. He has gone on that bus to New York City more times than I can count. Joe tirelessly reads material, thinks things through, talks about them with faculty members, and tries to understand where we are and to communicate that to the Trustees. I have often disagreed with Joe on many issues, but never once has my admiration for him flagged. I think he has been a wonderful public servant, in that role, and it's a pleasure for me to acknowledge his four years of service."

2. REMARKS BY A FACULTY TRUSTEE

Joseph M. Calvo, William T. Keeton Professor of Biology; Faculty Trustee: "Well, I didn't expect an introduction—and certainly not one like that. Thank you. Dick Schuler and I would like to establish a tradition whereby the Faculty-elected Trustees, at least once a year, bring to you some issue that is before the Board and that is of interest to all of us. As you can imagine, it's a little difficult to do this, because most of what the Board does, it does in private. But I'm going to try to give you some sense of the thinking—of at least some individuals on the Board—on the issue of residential communities, and I'll try to do that in just a few minutes.

"Let me start by trying to give you some sense of the background of the Board members. The working Board is made up of some sixty individuals, plus four ex-officio members. Of the sixty, thirty-eight are voting members; but, in fact, one can hardly distinguish between the voting members and the non-voting members. Essentially, all of the sixty work together and come to decisions as a whole. In addition, there is a sizable number of emeritus Board members, and of that number, some eight of them are presently very active and have committee assignments.

"So how are Board members selected? Some are elected, as you know: one by the employees, two by the students, and two by the Faculty; and then there are eight alumni who are elected, two each year. And I'd like to point out that there is some considerable effort and expense that's involved in running these elections. The student election is hotly contested and involves organizing an election for more than 10,000 students. Also, consider what's involved in running an election, each year, for alumni trustees. We have more than 100,000 alumni, and just the cost of a mailing to all of those alumni is considerable. Most of the Board members are elected, however, by the Board itself. That includes the Trustee Fellows—the non-voting members who make up part of the sixty—and other members at-large. Also, it's stipulated in the charter that at least two come from labor and two from agriculture.

"In terms of their association with Cornell, fifty-five out of the sixty have gotten a degree from Cornell. The Arts College and Engineering College are highly represented; also, there is a considerable number from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences and Industrial and Labor Relations.

"In terms of age distribution, it won't surprise anybody that most of the members are between fifty and sixty-five; so that represents, essentially, the group that graduated in the late 1950s and the early 1960s.

"In terms of where Board members come from, something like two-thirds of them come from the Northeast and the Mid-Atlantic region, with half of the members just coming from New York State alone. And then there's a smattering of Board

members coming from other parts of the country, and there are four who come from outside the U.S.

"In terms of their professional affiliations, there is a majority who come as the 'captains of industry'—they come from the financial world, real estate, and so forth. Another point is that they represent a large range of interests; this group certainly makes the Board an interesting group of individuals.

"In terms of how long individuals have served on the Board, a little more than half are just in their first term. There's about another third who are in their second term, and there's a smaller number of individuals who have served three terms or more. There are several individuals who have served the Board in the range of twenty-five years. As you can imagine, some of these Board members with long service are very influential members.

"With this background, let me now turn to this issue of residential housing. What I did was to call up a number of members of the Board—I reached a total of nine—and I had a conversation with each in the range of a half an hour or so. I didn't prompt them with questions; I just threw out this subject. Mostly, what they had to say focused on the freshman experience because, as you know, everybody is intensely interested in that question right now. So what I am relating to you are opinions of individuals; none of them would want their opinions taken to be the reaction of the Board as a whole. You can think of this as a kind of 'snapshot in time.' There's going to be a full debate at the coming Board meeting at the end of this month; and, certainly, some views may change after the debate. But here's what I heard from this group of individuals.

"Clearly there's a fear on the part of some of these individuals regarding the 'Balkanization' of the Campus. Essentially, this has a negative impact on the atmosphere and the environment here at Cornell. One of the Board members specifically spoke of the reputation of Cornell, and she personally knows of students who elected *not* to come here because of the feeling that the polarization on campus was a serious problem at Cornell. A number of her friends have questioned her about this and have wondered what was going on. So this, at least, was a factor in the minds of some. Then, there were more than several who keyed in on this point: our responsibility to ensure that freshmen have a broad, rather than a narrow, experience. One individual in particular referred to the Greek system and to the situation at Cornell in the early 1950s, when freshmen could start rush right when they first came to Cornell. Now, it's pretty much universally agreed that the system has worked out well, not having freshmen immediately joining the Greek system. In that same vein, these several individuals felt that that could be extended to the program houses. And one individual pointed out that in other institutions, random assignment of freshmen works perfectly well—there are not major problems with that at other universities.

"Several other individuals talked about a responsibility to ensure that freshmen have a good first-year experience. I'd like to convey to you a sense that I got that that's more than platitude. These individuals understand that making a real change in the environment of the dormitories at Cornell is going to cost us. The sense I got was that they felt it was worth the cost, even understanding that there are going to be trade-offs: putting in money to do that means not having money to do other things. I got a clear sense of that. Also, I got a sense that President Rawlings is very committed to making this a major part of his administration. Because of that, there's a good chance that something really will happen. One of the aspects of the current proposal is the idea that there should be a common experience for freshmen. I want to say that that's not something I've heard a lot in these conversations. One individual pointed out that she was very taken by the idea of something like a 'Cornell 101,' but that was not a theme I heard over and over again.

"Another thing that you might imagine is that individuals would voice support for the President. After all, the Board basically acts to support the President and the Administration. But I didn't hear that even once as a rationale, that 'we should do this because we should support the President.' What I did hear was that Rawlings' plan is a sensible plan that is moving Cornell in the right direction.

"In terms of whether there is a hidden agenda within the Board for wanting to do away with program houses—that's a question that arose several times—I can say that only one individual that I talked to made it clear that he would be happy not only to have freshmen not living in program houses—but that if we altogether had no program houses, we would be better off. Outside of that one individual, six others said they were strongly in favor of program houses and, indeed, that they should be strengthened.

"One individual again made a comparison to the Greek system. He pointed out that, in the early 1950s, when there was a lot of discussion about this issue, there was a lot of worry about the demise of the Greek system. Without the enthusiasm, energy, and financial support from the freshmen, the Greek system wouldn't be able to survive. There were also concerns about a hidden agenda at that time. His point was that that has not proven to be the case.

"Finally, I would like to mention that two individuals talked about their sympathy for the point of view of those students living in program houses who feel that it's absolutely a critical experience for them. In talking with students, they began to change their perspective or, at least, began to be not so sure about their previous stance on the issue. One of them has come around to feel that the real problem lies in this sort of 'Animal House' environment of West Campus, so what needs to be done is to put our efforts into trying to improve that environment—and to leave the program houses alone. That was one person's perspective. And two people mentioned that they fully expect to hold the Administration to their pledge of not putting in the part of the plan that deals with freshmen not living in program houses until all the residential units are improved.

"Those are the comments that I have to make to you, and I'd like to point out as a final remark that if you read the proposal of the Administration, you will find it laced with allusions to faculty involvement. In fact, on the two pages that I was just skimming, there were five references to an intent to try to get the Faculty more involved in residential communities. This is something that we clearly need to become engaged with as a faculty and discuss whether, in fact, that's feasible and whether there's the energy and the will out there to really cooperate with the Administration on this issue."

Speaker Obendorf: "Thank you, Joe."

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 10 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Speaker Obendorf: "I would like to turn to the consideration of the minutes of the April 10 meeting of the Faculty Senate. Do you have any corrections for those minutes? Hearing none, we can approve them by acclamation.

"I would like to move on to having the question-and-answer period with Provost Randel."

4. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH THE PROVOST

Professor William H. Lesser, Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics: "Provost Randel, in a few minutes we are going to be discussing the proposal for a major revision in our tenure evaluation process. Before that, I'd like to take just a minute, if I could, to consider some recent past events, and I'm concerned particularly with the ad-hoc procedure of appealing a negative tenure decision of the Provost following a positive recommendation by a dean. I believe Dean Stein prepared that procedure, perhaps at your request, and certainly, most likely, at your consent. During the Senate meetings this spring, I've tried on three occasions to get some substantive discussion here about the role and the appropriateness of a procedure like this, not influenced by the University Faculty Committee. And in all three cases, no substantive discussion has ensued. I believe, Provost Randel, that you were present during these three meetings. Most recently working through one of the members of the University Faculty Committee, I tried to get a little bit of time to get some discussion of that matter in their meeting, but that didn't advance, either. Apparently Dean Stein indicated, from his perspective, that that matter was closed.

"My question is this, Provost Randel: Since Dean Stein both drafted the procedures and maintains a significant role in establishing the agenda for the Senate, there's certainly a minimum appearance of a conflict of interest in his failure to withdraw himself from discussion on this matter. I'm wondering, Provost Randel, did you advise him with respect to that appearance and suggest that he might consider a different approach to the matter of the agenda?"

Provost Randel: "The short answer to that question is 'no'; that is, I did not advise the Dean in that way. But, in order to understand what's being talked about here, I think the Senators need to have a fuller understanding of the circumstances. Without wishing to discuss a particular question or case here, I will consider some of the fundamentals.

"What is at issue? In the first instance, this question has been asked—but it has not always been correctly understood. Does the President, or his designee—at present, the Provost—have the authority to turn down a positive recommendation that some member of the Faculty be promoted to tenure? That is, if the department is positive and if the dean sends a positive recommendation to the Provost, the President's designee, does the President always have the authority to say 'no' at that point? The answer is clearly 'yes.' The Faculty Appointments Manual makes clear that at all other levels, a 'two-no' system prevails—that is, if you get a 'no' at the department, you have a right to appeal. Likewise, if the college says 'no'—and that's the first 'no'—you have the right to appeal at the University-level. But the Appointments Manual makes it perfectly clear that that principle does not apply at the level of the President's Office. So the President's Office does have the authority to say a first 'no'—and that's it, without any provision for appeal.

"Such a case did arise last fall, in which the President's Office, namely I—acting as the President's designee—denied a positive recommendation from a dean for promotion to tenure, and this was the first 'no' in that case. A good deal of discussion ensued around the Campus, as many of you may know, about three cases, as it turned out, that

were sent back in varying ways&endash;but one was returned with a definitive 'no.'

"There was no obligation on anybody's part to offer any further appeal because the procedures are perfectly clear: the authority to issue a first and final 'no' does lie and does rest with the President's Office. Given the discussions, however, and given the fact that there had been a change in the Administration and that this particular case had been launched by one dean and went over the summer into the new Administration where there was not only a new dean but a new Provost, I, in consultation with Dean Stein, agreed that we would allow for an appeal of that decision. There was no obligation on anybody's part to offer such a mechanism of appeal. Similarly, there was no obligation on the part of the person in question to accept any mechanism for appeal. You have to understand that the background of this is that there is no right of appeal in this matter. Dean Stein and I, as I have said, determined that we would offer an appeal, so as to go the extra mile in a case which had been through two different sets of hands, as it were, to be sure that we were not taking actions that I, in particular, seemed to be doing something that was precipitous or what have you.

"In that view, a procedure was drafted that, in fact, mimics exactly the existing procedures when a second 'no' is permissible. But, let's back up: You're absolutely right. That procedure was ad-hoc, and it was drawn up for this particular case&endash;in our view so as to allow an extra option for the individual in question. But there was no obligation on anybody's part to offer such an option. If that appeals procedure is judged by anybody to be unfair or illegal, it's perfectly clear that the solution is not to exercise the option that we've offered, and it ends there. So I saw nothing to advise Dean Stein about, in that this was a conflict of interest or anything else."

Speaker Obendorf: "Okay, we could take time for one or two more questions."

Associate Professor Robert A. Corradino, Vet Physiology: "I was just curious as to the precedent as to your actions regarding these cases."

Provost Randel: "I have had some exchange with Professor, Vice-Provost, and Dean Emeritus W. Donald Cooke, who was the drafter, and indeed the sole author, of the University Appointments Manual, known often, therefore, as the 'Cooke Book.' In the course of our exchanges, he was the sole author of that, and it was discussed by the Faculty, but only barely at the time. He was involved in the Central Administration for a good many years over time, and, in fact, reports that in his day, in the Central Administration, a committee consisting of himself and various other Vice-Provosts and such did conduct these reviews&endash;and he reported that they turned down one a year or so. I, as Dean of Arts and Sciences, was under no illusion about Mal Nesheim's confidence that he had the right to turn back a promotion. Indeed, we received a few in our day in which he said, 'If I ever get another one like this, I will turn it down.' So, I think, the precedent is clear, and every incumbent of the office, going back quite some time, would assert forcefully that the right was there and that it had, in fact, been exercised."

Professor P. C. T. de Boer, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: "In view of what you said, do you believe the current system needs to be changed?"

Provost Randel: "My most profound belief about this&endash;and a good many other matters&endash;is that the Faculty should really assume the responsibility for maintaining its own very live nature. I think that should be, with respect certainly to academic quality, but also with respect to a great many other things: conflicts of interest, financial irregularity&endash;you name it. If the Faculty wishes&endash;and please believe that I speak as a member of the Faculty&endash;if we wish to be taken seriously in the governance of the Institution and in higher education in general, we will have to assume the responsibility to maintain our own standards, to police ourselves (I shudder at the phrase!) to be able to look the public in the eye and insist that we expect high standards from our students and from ourselves&endash;and that we do not need others to police us. If we don't do it for ourselves, others will, in due course. You know there's plenty of talk about such matters. So I think this is a perfect example of the way in which the Faculty could exercise the kind of responsibility for maintaining its own standards that would be, altogether, appropriate and welcome. The ultimate authority will continue to rest with the President or his designee; there's no doubt about that. But I, for one, would welcome a much greater collaboration on this end between the Administration and the Faculty&endash;so we can break out of this notion that, somehow, once you go into the Central Administration, you become some sort of administrative hack and take leave of your academic thoughts and judgment and do crazy things. I would much rather, as Provost, be advised by a committee of wise people from the Faculty who represent the Faculty's perspective of what our sense of academic standards ought to be."

Speaker Obendorf: "Thank you, Provost Randel."

"I think that we should move along with our agenda. Before I introduce Professors Mary Beth Norton and S. Gordon Campbell to

preface the next discussion, I believe that all the Senators received information that it is the University Faculty Committee's decision that today we will be functioning for informal discussion of the committee of the whole. There will be a meeting one week from now, on May 15, wherein we will formally amend or debate and take vote on the issues. So today we're going to function for discussion only. With that, I'd like to introduce Professor Norton and Professor Campbell."

5. DISCUSSION ON A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A PROCEDURE FOR UNIVERSITY FACULTY REVIEW OF TENURE APPOINTMENTS

Mary Beth Norton, Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History: "I'm pleased to be here today to introduce this extremely important discussion on behalf of the University Faculty Committee. I'd like to underscore that the members of the University Faculty Committee agree that wide-ranged input is needed from the Faculty as a whole, and that is why the entire Senate agenda today is, essentially, devoted to this topic; and that is why all of next week's agenda will be devoted to this topic as well.

"The members of the University Faculty Committee have been discussing this topic intensively and almost—but not quite—exclusively, ever since you all elected us a couple of months ago. We are, however, only nine people; and we do not represent all fields, as some of you have pointed out in your comments that we have received so far on this draft that we present here to you today. The proposed structure of the University Faculty Committee on Appointments, which my colleague Professor Campbell will discuss in a moment, is, as our cover letter indicated, modified and adapted from a system used at the University of Wisconsin. This represents our best effort to solve a series of knotty problems; but I think that I can safely say for my colleagues on the University Faculty Committee that we are not firmly wedded to the specific solutions proposed in the current draft if many faculty members find them unacceptable. What we are wedded to, however, is the notion that we should establish this committee and that we should do so with dispatch—this spring, if possible, or as soon as possible in the fall, if a consensus of the Senate cannot be reached in the next few weeks. Now why do I say that? I have four reasons for making these points, and I'm drawing here on the discussions we've had in the University Faculty Committee meetings, in part—but also, I have to say, on some of my own experiences.

"First, it is perhaps unnecessary to point out to this body, which includes many people who have taught at other major university institutions, that Cornell is unusual, and perhaps even unique, in not having a committee like this to review appointments to tenure at the University level. Now that alone is not an adequate justification for establishing such a committee. But there are good reasons why most universities have found such committees desirable—most notably, as Part I of the draft states, to ensure that consistently high standards of evaluation are applied across different disciplines and different colleges. This is especially important in our current era of severe fiscal constraints, where mistakes that are made in tenure decisions—whether those mistakes are positive or negative, I might add—can have significant long-term implications for departments, colleges, and the University as a whole. It seemed to us that we could only benefit from increased scrutiny by scholars at the University level.

"Second, it's no news to anyone in this room that we have a new President and a new Provost and that our University's new leaders are changing the way things are done around here—and not just with respect to appointments to tenure, as we, of course, were reminded by Trustee Calvo's presentation at the beginning of our meeting and as all of us were reminded during the presentations that occurred on Campus last week. It is important, I think, that the Faculty take part in this process of change and in the new leadership of the University. What's relevant here, in particular, to the establishment of the University Faculty Committee on Appointments, is the movement toward greater integration of course offerings and faculty appointments across colleges as well as the desire of the Central Administration to remove unnecessary duplication. We believe that the University Faculty Committee on Appointments will assist in achieving this goal. (And those of you who are economists will know that this process is already proceeding apace with respect to certain discourse.) Increasingly, faculty members on this Campus are going to have an increasing stake in the decisions that are made about appointments to tenure in colleges other than their own. The University Faculty Committee on Appointments will regularize and formalize that voice which, I might say, is now unheard—except in those rare cases in which a member of one college's faculty is asked to serve on an ad-hoc committee in another college. I have to say that in twenty-some-odd years here on Campus, that's happened to me exactly once, whereas I've repeatedly served on ad-hoc committees within in the Arts College. So if the Faculty in general wants to have a voice in appointments across colleges, we need a mechanism like the University Faculty Committee on Appointments to provide that voice.

"Third, as the Provost has just explained, he has made it clear today and by his actions this past year that he believes that the Provost-level review of tenure recommendations—which some of us have come to regard as somewhat *pro forma*—that that level of review is going to be a serious and rigorous review from this time on—and consistently so, even if in the past it was only occasionally exercised. He has indicated to the University Faculty Committee what he just indicated to the Senate here a few minutes ago, which is that he would welcome the creation of a University Faculty Committee

on Appointments to advise him on tenure decisions. We believe it's imperative for the Faculty to accept this invitation to participate in these reviews and that the University Faculty Committee on Appointments be, in large part, elected. Professor Campbell will explain to you why we set it up the way we did, in terms of some elected members and some appointed members. We think it's important that the University Faculty Committee on Appointments be elected in large part, because that will ensure that the members of the area subcommittees are respected by their colleagues. We also think it's very important that the advice on tenure decisions be separated—that we separate intellectual assessments from financial assessments. That is, one could predict (or imagine) a future provost—in times even more fiscally constrained than our own—deciding to turn down recommendations to tenure primarily to save money or to achieve some other administrative goal not related to scholarly excellence. I'm sure we've all heard stories from other universities around the country where exactly this is happening, in ways to prevent too much of the faculty or too high a percentage of the faculty from becoming tenured. It is not to say that if the University Faculty Committee on Appointments votes positively on an appointment that the Provost will not turn it down, still; because, as Provost Randel explained, this power does lie in the Office of the President or to the designee of the President. However, I think that the University Faculty Committee feels very strongly that it's going to be much more difficult for a future provost, who might have some sort of hidden agenda, to turn down an appointment, if there is a strongly positive recommendation from a faculty-elected and University-wide tenure committee. I also want to align myself with what the Provost just said: I think it's crucial that faculty take on this responsibility. Those of you who know what I have done over the years here at this University—including my own years as a Faculty Trustee—and those of you who happened to see my essay on sexual harassment that was printed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in December—know that I have long argued for the Faculty taking responsibility, and the Faculty policing itself, and the Faculty being responsible for upholding its own standards. And that's why I so firmly align myself with this particular proposal.

"Fourth, let me deal with the issue of timing. Some of you have said or have recommended that this decision be postponed until fall to allow for further discussion and reflection. Of course that's possible, and it very well might happen that after two meetings of the Senate: We might decide that we have not had enough discussion or debate, and we might want to postpone this decision. I would argue, however, that we should listen to what's said by everyone here, and let's listen to what's said and decided next week before we make a decision about postponing it until the fall. I think the decision should be resolved now, if possible. And the reason for that is the following: If this committee is not in place during the next academic year, the Provost and three other administrators that he has designated to assist him on this will continue to conduct these reviews, just as they did this year. In addition to the fact that there are better things that they could be doing with their time, postponement will simply delay the implementation of Faculty input at the University level. In short, it seems to me that the choice the Senate is facing is *not*, 'Will there be serious reviews of tenure appointments at the level of the Provost's Office?'—that's not the choice. The choice is rather, 'Who is going to conduct those serious reviews?' Are those reviews going to be conducted by a large group of faculty, elected largely by their peers; or are they going to be conducted by a small group of administrators named by the Provost. Therefore, I think we need to move with dispatch to adopt some form of this proposal. I'll now turn the lectern over to my colleague, Professor Campbell, who will talk about some of the specifics of what we are proposing to you today."

Professor S. Gordon Campbell, Veterinary Microbiology: "Good afternoon. My name is Gordon Campbell, and I'm from the Veterinary College. I have been asked by the University Faculty Committee to say something about the structure of what is proposed. Since it is before you, I shall be very brief.

"The University Faculty Committee looked at several models before preparing this one, and the one in front of you is based on the structure used at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, with some modifications. At Wisconsin, they also have four areas within the University, and they have twelve faculty members elected from these areas. Our proposal consists of nine faculty members in four areas, which have been specified; six of these faculty members will be elected by the Hare system, and three will be appointed by the Administration. We felt that was a better mix, because this will allow for some adjustment by discipline if there is bad skewing in the elections. For instance, we have found that in the University Faculty Committee, the College of Engineering is not represented by an elected member, and that is, on occasions, disadvantageous at the meetings. We are hoping with this mix of elected and appointed faculty members to these area subcommittees that we will have the ideal mix.

"The four subcommittees will receive the assembled dossiers from the Provost, and they will report back to the Provost. They are essentially advising committees to the Provost, as he mentioned in his remarks earlier. I would like to reiterate that the choice of areas within these four divisions that are in front of you will be entirely up to the individual faculty members, as will any changes that he or she chooses to make at a later date. It is hoped that, with this structure, we'll have fairly broad University-wide perspective on these promotions and that these subcommittees will gain experience as time goes on and as

they review more dossiers for promotion.

"I'd like to give you a few numbers that have been provided to me, so that you get some idea of the dimension of this work. There are presently about forty appointments advanced per year. Given four area subcommittees, this will require each subcommittee to scan and make recommendations concerning approximately ten folders each year, which is, we feel, a reasonable amount.

"Lastly, on a personal note, because of the area I represent, I've had some concerns expressed to me by faculty members—notably those in extension and in the clinical sciences and in the Veterinary College. Various members of the University Faculty Committee have talked with people at the University of Wisconsin, and the reports that have come back have not always been exactly the same. But, in general, they have been reassuring and quite positive. That's all I have to say about the structure. The members of the University Faculty Committee are all here, and I'm sure they'd be delighted to answer any questions you may have."

Speaker Obendorf: "Thank you. I want to remind you that we're having discussion, and I'd like to try to get to as many of you who would like to speak as possible. With that in mind, I would like to begin discussion."

Associate Professor Lois S. Willett, Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics: "I would like to thank Dean Stein and the University Faculty Committee for adjusting the plan for this meeting so that no vote will be taken at this meeting. I'd also like to thank the thirty or so members who responded to the e-mail from Bill Lesser and me regarding our concerns with the speed with which this issue has been raised and we have been asked to discuss the issue.

"I have several concerns regarding the proposal to establish a University Faculty Committee on Tenure Appointments. First of all, I feel that a proposal of this magnitude and importance ought to be accompanied by some kind of statement that identifies the problem that the proposal is to address, identifies alternative ways to address that problem—their advantages and disadvantages—and then includes a justification for the selected alternative proposal. I found little of this material accompanying this proposal, although some of that justification has been clarified already by the comments this afternoon.

"Second, it is quite clear to me that this proposal appears to be not well thought out or scrutinized by the University Faculty Committee. For example, I know that the proposed committee is first referred to as the 'University Faculty Committee on Tenure Appointments' in paragraph I, and it is referred to as the 'University Faculty Committee on Appointments' in paragraph II. These, to me, have different connotations, and I think that some sort of clarification needs to be made with respect to that. I also found no justification for identifying four area subcommittees rather than five or six; and I also found no justification for the linking of subject areas within these area subcommittees. For example, why is law associated with social sciences, when they follow completely different reasonings?

"I'd also like to note, thirdly, that there is no identification as to how this proposal fits in with the references to the tenure and appointment procedures that are contained in our Faculty Handbook and in the Faculty Appointments Manual that was referred to by Provost Randel. There is, I feel, some ambiguity as to how the members of the area subcommittees will be selected. There's reference that the Provost and the Nominations and Elections Committee will be mindful of diversity when nominating the remaining members, but we're not clear how that diversity will be maintained. Again, earlier this afternoon, it was mentioned that there would be a Hare system for election, and then the Provost would attempt to achieve diversity with appointments after that.

"I'd also like to indicate that in the proposal as it is presented, the role of the Provost is not clearly identified. Provost Randel did say to us this afternoon that he feels—and others feel—that the role of the Provost as the President's designee is, I suppose in my words, 'all-powerful.' I think that, if, in fact, that is the case, that should be indicated in the proposal.

"Also, the proposal indicates that a positive recommendation requires a simple majority of the review participants. However, the criteria for a negative recommendation from the committee is not identified at all in the proposal. Henceforth, I think that because of the importance of the issue, the limited information provided with the proposal, and the discrepancies and ambiguities within the proposal, I feel that the proposal should be sent back to the committee and that that committee—the University Faculty Committee—ought to establish a special committee to look further at this issue and to prepare a well-thought-out, complete, detailed proposal for the Senate to consider in the fall."

Associate Professor Michael O. Thompson, Materials Science and Engineering: "I have actually a question for the committee. The University of Wisconsin's model has been brought forward. Could you tell us how often and how successful it has been at the University of Wisconsin? In other words, how do the faculty at large react to a denial of tenure when it is given by this

committee?"

Dean Stein: "I guess it must depend on who you talk to. I myself don't consider as a figure of merit the number of tenure appointments that are turned down."

Professor Thompson: "Have there been any?"

Dean Stein: "Yes, there have been. I actually spoke to the person who administers that at some length, and the number of appointments that get turned down varies by the divisional committees. Some turn down more than others. I can't remember now which ones turn down more, but I believe that the physical sciences committee turns down the greatest percentage and that the humanities turns down the least of the four."

"I've talked with a number of people, and what I heard, at least, was general acceptance. At Madison, it's been a part of their process for a long time, so people—at least the ones who talked to me—think of it as being successful. I spoke to one dean, though, who said it was a disaster. So I asked him why he thought it was a disaster, and he said he didn't think faculty outside his college had any business interfering in appointments. I asked him how many were turned down, but he said they only actually turned down one in the last ten years or so. That dean was the only person who responded in a vociferously negative way. The rest of the people were, for the most part, positive about the system."

Associate Professor Kathleen M. Rasmussen, Nutritional Sciences: "Our faculty has discussed this at some length, because ours is a department that doesn't fit very nicely into the scheme that has been laid out. We have everyone from molecular biologists to food economists in our department. We feel there are four reasons that the committee should think further about this proposal in its current form."

"First, the proposal, in its current form, does not address the appeals process—if there is or isn't one—and if there is one, what it should be. Basically, it's the situation that the Provost just addressed."

"Secondly, there is very little allowance in this proposal for people who do interdisciplinary work. You have to pick one of these areas or another, and if the fit isn't good, there is no allowance for something else. Being reviewed by two areas and having twice as many people look at your dossier isn't really a solution. Some recognition of that is needed, and some solution for that problem, which we can anticipate will occur often, needs to be reached."

"Thirdly, there is no accounting in this current proposal for differences in departmental expectations of faculty. We have faculty who have appointments that are seventy percent extension. That produces a very different dossier than a fifty-fifty appointment or a sixty-forty appointment in the other direction. How that would be accounted for isn't clear in this document, and I think it needs to be, if we're going to continue to hire people with different effort distributions."

"Lastly, particularly our faculty who have yet to go through this process are concerned that the process be timely and not too bureaucratic. It's very slow as it is now. I think that whatever we propose needs to be something that can happen with a reasonable degree of speed. It wasn't clear to us in looking at this that what is offered is going to be able to happen with a reasonable degree of speed."

"I second the motion of my colleague that this be sent back to the University Faculty Committee for further thought on these issues which are in addition to the ones previously raised. Thank you."

Professor David M. Bates, Bailey Hortorium: "I'm concerned about two things at the moment. One, I would like to see an explanation and a full clarification of what's meant by 'excellence.' This is certainly not defined in the draft, and this draft makes no reference to existing documents; by consequence, there's no way to judge how this is to be determined—or it might be determined by the committee itself, determined by their own experiences and by what they consider to be 'excellent.'"

"The second point, which I think is a crucial point for people in my department, is that this proposal essentially moves the decision-making process out of the college and expresses it, then, on the level of the University. Whether this is desirable or not depends on one's opinion; it effectively negates the influence of both the department and the colleges and their decisions. We would like that issue debated and clarified in discussion."

Professor Terrence L. Fine, Electrical Engineering: "I have so much to disagree with in this proposal that I'm finding myself disagreeable; and I'm having trouble knowing where to begin."

Speaker Obendorf: "We'll ask you to be as brief as possible."

Professor Fine: "First, what is the problem? The problem that I've heard is that the Provost has turned back a case—that seems to be the key problem—and perhaps he threatens to do so in the future. I'm not sure that I'm enormously upset by his exercise of that one case out of, roughly, forty; I'm not sure that it particularly bothers me. Is this a problem that needs fixing, I wonder?"

"The first thing, to me, that the Provost should be doing when he has a problem with appointments coming from a department is going to the dean. The dean sets academic standards in his or her college, and the chair and the tenured faculty members maintain academic standards in their department. Those are the units you talk to when you have a problem in appointments coming out of a department. If you want to respect the Faculty, you don't form a pick-up committee of faculty—three from here and six from here and six from column 'd'—that maybe covers this entire University (and this is a very hard university to cover)—you don't do that; you respect the decision-making ability of the tenured faculty in the department, of the chair of the department, of the ad-hoc committee in the college, and of the dean of the college. That's what you respect—not some group of people that perhaps has no conception of what's going on across these areas. I'm not interested in really revising the proposal; I'd just like to send it into the trash can. But it has this view of the University that made me wonder where I'd put Hotel and Architecture (I found their letter quite compelling) and the Law School and all these other things. Yes, maybe I'd stick some of engineering with the physical sciences, and I guess you'd put mathematics with the physical sciences, because that's the way it's done in the Graduate School, blah, blah, blah. But none of it makes a great deal of sense. The fact that it happens at other universities does not mean that it's going to be easier here. So the system is based on one at Wisconsin—which, by the way, according to the ratings I'm familiar with, doesn't yet achieve the rank of Cornell—nor does Iowa, nor does Colorado—none of these places have yet reached our ranking. They have their own histories, and they've come to whatever system they've come to, for their own reasons—and those are not necessarily our reasons. We've had a system—and I've been here for thirty years—and it seems that this system has worked very well, at least in the College of Engineering. We're doing quite fine. If there's a problem in other departments, address that problem. This is not a fix for a problem. This is just another band-aid on top of other band-aids. It does not help the wound—if there is one. (I'm not convinced that there is one.) If there is a problem and the Provost wants to be activist, let him go to the people who are most intimately involved with it.

"That brings me to one other point, which I'm going to raise here. It's this metaphor of excellence and uniform standards of excellence. I think also of the phrase 'raising the bar'—we hear about that, too. When it's pole vaulting, I know what you're talking about. You push the bar up against gravity, and it goes up. Most of us know which way gravity goes, so we know how to 'raise the bar.' But when it comes to judging a faculty member in Electrical Engineering or in Personnel Management of the Hotel School or wherever, the bar goes in many different directions. I think that precious few of us, as individual faculty, are fit to judge that. The people who are fit to judge that are the faculty and the dean of that particular college. I can perfectly well grant the Provost the right to say that he's dissatisfied with what's coming out of a college and perhaps to take one out of forty or a hundred cases and send it back. That does not bother me if he wishes to spend his time that way. What bothers me is that this does not respect faculty governance to have this committee—it disrespects it. There's a very strong grass-roots system of faculty governance here with regard to the contribution to tenure decision. This just spits in the face of that."

Associate Professor Vincent Mulcahy, Architecture, said that: "A number—if not the majority—of his colleagues would probably agree with what Professor Fine said."

He then read the May 3, 1996 memorandum that was prepared by a number of his colleagues and himself. This memorandum referred to the Proposed New Tenuring Procedures. Professor Mulcahy also commented on the document (see below) that accompanied the memorandum. It is titled: "An Architecture Department Response to: Draft Text for the Institution of a University Faculty Committee on Appointments (Dated April 22, 1996)."

Absence of a Documented Rationale

Neither the document distributed to faculty members nor the accompanying memorandum from the University Faculty Committee suggest any reason to believe that the academic and/or research standards of Cornell University would improve with the adoption of a tenure procedure currently being practiced at the University of Wisconsin at Madison. We have been presented with no evidence of qualitative improvements at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, nor with any indication that our situation more closely resembles that at the University of Wisconsin than at any other American university. (The University of Wisconsin at Madison has no professional architectural program, for example.)

Implicit Biases and Absence of Standards

There are two reasons given for the establishment of such a committee. The first is that "a dean's recommendation to grant tenure was very rarely denied by the Provost," implying that such a condition is a deficiency in the system rather than a testament to the quality of our currently tenured faculty or of the tenuring procedures in which University-wide cross-disciplinary input is provided in the context of a College ad-hoc committee.

The second reason is that "the same high standards of excellence [should be] applied throughout the University." This implies that Cornell University has until now either been granting tenure based upon lower standards of excellence, or upon diverse standards of high excellence. Surely, the latter is the case. This raises the following issue that must be discussed before instituting such a radical change in procedures of tenuring: what is a "consistent standard of excellence" and does not the concept of uniformity across disciplinary boundaries already suggest an increased valuation to the more superficially identifiable measures of interdisciplinary quality with a collateral devaluation of those qualities that may be specific to a discipline?

The proposal never mentions the standards that would be applied in the evaluation of tenure cases. How would the committee locate those external experts who are "appropriately knowledgeable and impartial"? Would the standards for tenure established by the individual colleges and their departments be superseded by some new standards determined by the subcommittees on an ad hoc basis? Or will new, interdisciplinary standards be drafted by the UFCA? Will the candidate be informed of these standards?

Power Shifts and Their Implications

While we support in principle the creation of a new entity to advise the Provost on tenure appointments, this proposal represents a potentially dangerous shift of power from the offices of the academic deans to the office of the Dean of Faculty. A college dean and an ad hoc committee have the ability to make recommendations based upon sophisticated criteria or combinations of criteria that can adequately locate an individual within a discipline or across relevant disciplinary boundaries. The individuality of the faculty member and the uniqueness of the faculty member's contribution can be recognized. Under the present proposal, the Dean of Faculty and the Area Subcommittee can only approximately locate the tenure candidate within a generalized, prefabricated version of a mythically homogenous university. This does no service to the candidate, nor to the candidate's discipline, nor to the University.

The Four Areas

Architecture is not easily or adequately represented by any one of the four area subcommittees to be established under the proposal. Architecture is not *just* an art or humanity, not *just* a biological science, not *just* a social science, and not *just* a physical science. The necessity to conform to any one of these areas can only hobble the tenure chances of a faculty member in architecture.

Having no "constitutional" protection against majority actions promulgated by the larger voting entities on campus, many smaller departments, especially those involved with the professional, performing and/or creative arts, found themselves excluded from the development of this proposal. It is likely that members of these same departments would be similarly excluded from the proposed area subcommittees. This deficiency would be calamitous in the evaluation of faculty members in programs such as architecture—a professional, nationally accredited program that has specific and unique standards of teaching, service, practice and research.

The Problem of Timing

We are very careful not to make significant changes in degree requirements once students have begun a specific academic program. Once a faculty member has accepted a tenure track contract based upon certain published tenure policies and procedures, changing the rules seems at best disingenuous on the part of the University; at worst, unethical. Any significant new procedures should not be implemented until they have been published, and they should apply only to those faculty members who were informed of these procedures at the time of their hiring.

Necessity for Further Discussion

In the past, issues raised by the University Faculty—and issues such as financial aid and conflicts of interest and commitment—have been discussed amply and thoroughly at all levels of faculty participation, beginning with the departmental. Tenure procedures are too important to the formation of a faculty and to the construction of an academic discipline to commit to a course of action without engaging the faculty itself in a comprehensive discourse. To inform the faculty and then, two weeks later, hold a vote on any issue is difficult enough if done in the midst of a semester. To present the faculty with a sketchy, flawed proposal and then propose to vote on it during the hectic last two weeks at the end of a semester, can be interpreted as either an underestimation of faculty workloads or a tactical attempt to furtively pass unsound legislation.

In either case, the only logical and ethical procedure would be to reintroduce this legislation to the faculty at the beginning of the fall semester and then proceed with extensive faculty consultation and discussion.

Summary

The Department of Architecture in the College of Architecture, Art, and Planning supports the idea of high standards in the granting of tenure. We also support the President and the Provost's position that a new entity is necessary to assist in the vastly consequential yet increasingly onerous task of evaluating faculty members for tenure. However, we also believe that the University Faculty Committee on Tenure Appointments as proposed by the Members of the University Faculty Committee is flawed both conceptually and structurally so that it could not possibly accomplish such an objective fairly and in full recognition of the diversity of academic disciplines that constitute Cornell University.

Specifically, we are troubled by the absence of any clearly stated rationale for the recommendations as they are made. Moreover, there are substantive ideological biases that underlie the proposed procedure, biases specifically pertaining to the concept of uniform and consistent standards of excellence. These biases have not been discussed. Nor have there been discussions of the consequences of the power shifts implied by the document, or the ethical issues raised by a sudden change in tenuring procedures.

There are a number of crucial gaps in the document, suggesting potentially serious problems in the implementation of a fair and equitable procedure for evaluation. Clarity is a general problem with the proposal. The vagueness of the document is especially troublesome in its insistence on consistent standards of evaluation without ever enumerating those standards, or even indicating the sources from which those standards might be garnered.

Insofar as the Department of Architecture is primarily a professional program that does not easily conform to most generalized systems of academic categorization, the proposed system of four area subcommittees appears to be wholly inadequate for our purposes.

We urge that discussion of this important issue be allowed to occur at the various departmental and college levels, argue that sufficient time and appropriate consultative process have not been permitted or attempted since the April 23, 1996 distribution of the proposal, and request that the proposal be tabled pending such appropriate procedure.

Professor Katherine V. Stone, Law: "Let me tell you that we at the Law School are uniformly and resoundingly opposed to the proposal. We have four main objections to it, which I'll elaborate on briefly.

"First, it adds a level of bureaucracy to an already lengthy appointments process, adding burdens to busy faculty members in addition to the deans. It will change the timing of tenure evaluations so they will have to be completed much earlier in the year, which will put an immense burden on our appointments process. Furthermore, and most important, to us it will undercut flexibility in lateral appointments, which are a major source of Law School appointments and court appointments; and these are appointments where timing is often very tight, and it's very crucial to have some flexibility in order to attract truly excellent scholars. So we feel that it will undermine our ability to make the most important kinds of appointments that we make.

"Secondly, we think that it will actually end up lowering academic standards, as it will permit faculty and even the Provost to 'pass the buck' on weak or dubious cases, assuming that it will be on somebody else's shoulders instead of their own if they want to turn someone down. We think, instead, that faculties and schools should be forced to make the hard decisions themselves, especially since they are the ones who will live with the results of their tenure decisions.

"Third, we think the proposal impedes in the disciplinary worth. It divides the intellectual universe into four boxes, and it is

therefore apparently impossible with respect to any efforts at interdisciplinary work. Law is sometimes humanities, sometimes social sciences, and sometimes accountable to its own professional culture and norms. The proposal requires that people be shoehorned into positions of these Arts College categories and is therefore inappropriate, especially for professional schools such as the Law School.

"Fourth, we question whether members of the committee, who have little knowledge of a particular field, can make a meaningful assessment on the merit of a candidate's worth—and particularly whether they can make a better assessment than the relevant department's faculty can. It's likely to be a committee of somewhat randomly selected generalists with no particular qualifications of specialty in any particular field that may come before them. Let me just add to that, parenthetically, that based as this is on the University of Wisconsin, at least the University of Wisconsin Law School over the past number of years has taken a precipitous drop in every rating—a more dramatic drop than any other law school in the country. Now there's more that one could say to that. But let me also say that we do believe that there should be a tough and substantive review of tenure decisions by the Provost. That is the Provost's job, and that is what we want the Provost to do and to do well. If there are cases, we acknowledge that you've raised some concerns that perhaps something irregular has happened regarding promotion in various schools. But in those cases, the Provost should be able to appoint a special ad-hoc review committee composed of experts in the particular field of the review. We would want that to be composed of, perhaps, two members from the relevant school or faculty and, perhaps, three from outside that school—and maybe even someone from outside Cornell to advise the Provost only on the candidate's scholarship. We think that a model like that would work better here; you'll find one similar to that at UCLA and other places, and we think a model like that should be explored. But we are, as I've said, absolutely opposed to the proposal that's before us today."

Professor Barry K. Carpenter, Chemistry: "I'm a little puzzled by the logic of the last three speakers, and perhaps you can help me out. If a faculty committee is going to have all this difficulty assessing who is excellent, how is the Provost able to do it? Is the Provost super-human? I have great respect for the Provost, but these decisions do have to be made. So I suppose the question to be asked is, 'Is this decision going to be made by administrators, or is it going to be made by faculty?'"

Professor David Gries, Computer Science: "I think the Provost may need some help in some cases, but not in all forty cases—to have ten faculty members read these very long dossiers—every single one of them—is a waste of time. And as Professor Willett said earlier, I think the right thing to do is to have the Provost review the cases. If he sees one that he feels needs further looking into—that he may feel he wants to turn down—that's the time to institute a committee to look at it. Those are the only situations wherein such a committee should be necessary."

Associate Professor Alan K. McAdams, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "It's pretty clear from what we've just been listening to that the various colleges in this University have different missions. These different missions need to be evaluated by different criteria. When you say 'uniform excellence,' I don't know how you achieve that over the vast range of missions that we have. Let me give you a couple of examples.

"A fellow Senator serves on a committee in Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, and he has brought to our attention—and to the attention of other members of the Johnson School—the job description for the person who is being evaluated. Few, if any, of my colleagues would apply for that position. And we would be very unlikely to hire anyone who met the job description. We are different schools. How do we achieve excellence across these areas? I think we can, but I do not believe that some ad-hoc group of faculty members who does not know our school and does not fully understand the School of Agriculture and Life Sciences is likely to understand it.

"Similarly, in Operations Research, there are many people who are highly qualified and excellent who we would not hire. And we would not hire them because our school is a professional school, and we have to deal with applied disciplines, and we have to be 'relevant.' Similarly, we have many highly qualified people who would not be hired by the Department of Operations Research but who are outstanding in our own school. So what we see is a vast range of missions and great difficulty in responding to a vague statement of 'uniform excellence.'"

Professor Richard E. Schuler, Economics, Civil & Environmental Engineering, and Faculty Trustee: "I've a great deal of sympathy with some of the problems that seem to emerge with relation to people who have joint appointments. Let me just address a narrow, technical example. In my own case, I have a fifty-fifty appointment in two colleges that span two of these particular areas. While I appreciate the flexibility of allowing the faculty member to choose his or her affiliation and to be able to change this affiliation, it still is an all-or-nothing kind of choice. My first question is, 'When is that choice to be made?' If that faculty member makes that choice before his or her department and college has evaluated the individual for tenure, he or she risks losing the approbation of the other fifty percent of the faculty in the other department. So it would seem to me, just as a

technical matter, the candidate would keep his or her cards close to his or her vest until after everything went through the college. Only then could he or she declare an affiliation. Is this the kind of poker we're playing in this process?"

Ronald G. Ehrenberg, Irving M. Ives Professor of Industrial & Labor Relations and Vice President, Academic Programs, Planning, and Budgeting: "I used to think of tenure decisions very much as tools for the endowment campaign. We just completed a very successful endowment campaign, and yet we often seem much poorer when we start thinking about it—except in the specific programs that benefited. The reason that we did the Campaign was so that we'd be better-off in the long run. Tenure decisions are very much like that. All of the pressure in many parts of the University is to give people tenure because of something central that they are doing in the college, and because of their department, and because of the feeling that if you don't give them tenure you may lose the position. Although the dean has promised to give it back to you, there's no guarantee that you'll get it back in the short-run; or there may be the concern that it will take you a number of years to find a person who could do part of the job that the candidate does well. So I think that's part of the reason why there's a case for central review of these tenure candidates.

"For the past sixty of these files, I've had the pleasure with two other people of reading each of these files before it gets to the Provost. The way we do it is sort of interesting. It turns out, rather coincidentally, that one of us is a humanist, one is a social scientist, and one is a scientist. What we do is that we each look at the files, and I would say that in ninety percent of the files, you can sort of see the answer before you even start reading closely. The fact that there are ten or fifteen files per group will not impose a lot of work on the committee, because in most cases, the Faculty will be making the right decisions. In the cases where there is some concern, what we do is that each of us writes down what our concerns are on a sheet. We don't see other people's sheets until after each of us has read the file. Remarkably, if any one person has a concern, each of the other people also has the same concern. So I guess what I'm saying is that there's been a lot of concern expressed here about being able to define 'excellence' and standards across colleges. If you read enough files, it's *obvious*. That's exactly the reason why the committee has to look at all of the files. Because unless they see the good files, they will not have an understanding of what questionable files are."

Associate Professor Anil Netravali, Textiles and Apparel: "I believe that all departments and all our colleges on campus do away with having the excellent standards of their faculty members. There's more to it than that. I represent the physical sciences area, where there are several departments and several colleges involved, and I feel that the standards are not level for all faculty members who enter these departments and colleges in the level of support that's given to those faculty members. One example is the division of commitment given to different faculty members in different colleges. Given time, all those faculty members will be valued for their own levels of teaching and research and service. When it comes to the support, we point fingers at the department and the college; when it comes to standards, we turn to the University. The question is, 'Is that fair for all the faculty members?' If their support is fueled by the department and college, is it correct also to have standards that we try to apply from the University level? We need to have consistent standards at the University level, but we also need to discuss how we can make them more beneficial for all the faculty members."

Professor Howard W. Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior: "I want to take great exception to the position taken by my friend and colleague Professor Ehrenberg. I think that's an incredibly cynical view. I think that what goes on in our department and every department in the Section of Biological Sciences is that we make our very best effort in putting forward people for tenure. We make heart-breaking decisions about our junior faculty; that's the price we pay for excellence. But I think we do that across the entire University. If we adopt such a cynical view that people are putting professors forward for tenure simply to hold the position, then I think that's going to become a self-fulfilling prophecy that will kill the spirit of this University. I feel very strongly that Professor Fine is absolutely right—that tenure is something that comes from the grass-roots. It's been successful, and we are successful because we've held to these standards. If we adopt this other position I think we're just doomed to go down the drain."

Associate Professor Mary H. Tabacchi, Hotel Administration: "We've been silent for a while, but I'd think that I'd like to mention the fact that we, too, object to this proposal. We're not even mentioned here. Maybe we're like the Law School or the Johnson School, etc. But I have a hard time with this, and our faculty has a hard time with this. We are very concerned about our junior faculty. We have a couple here, in fact, who are very outstanding people. And we work very hard to make sure that our people will be excellent. But excellence may mean something different from school to school, and I urge this body to consider that seriously."

Associate Professor Kerry H. Cook, Soil, Crop and Atmospheric Sciences: "I'd like to underscore the point that was made by Professor Netravali about the different financial streams that come into different colleges. In the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, for example, we've suffered decreases—five percent per year—and that's going to be going on for

some time. We wish that if we are one University for the tenure decisions, perhaps we could be financially one University also."

Professor John E. H. Sherry, Hotel Administration: "About six to eight months ago, this subject was broached in your prior FCR Executive Committee. So it would be hypocritical for me now to criticize either Dean Stein or the Provost for raising an issue that came up with Frank Rhodes a year ago, because I think we have to face it. The problem really is not so much our tenure review procedures but rather that we have too heavy a ratio of tenured faculty to total faculty population. I'm not sure this solution is the right one for that problem. I would suggest, yes, that we tighten up our tenure review procedures—but we do that in our colleges. In the Hotel School, we've had to make two very critical decisions recently. I can testify to that, because I was the chair of one of those, and I was the chair of a tenure review matter that is now on appeal and that is being discussed by a University Appeals Board.

"I'm wondering if we're aiming our barbs at the wrong target. If our ratios are too high, compared to other comparable schools, we can help to encourage older faculty, like myself, to relinquish our positions—I think most of us would do so graciously, as I've had the pleasure to serve Cornell for some twenty-five-odd years by some sort of inducements. But I think that's an important consideration. Why should we belabor ourselves with another level of bureaucracy, when the problem could be resolved more simply by saying that we need to encourage those, one way or the other—either negatively or positively—to move on; and those can be done on individual bases. There are not very many of those, particularly on the negative side. But I agree with my colleagues that I don't find we are lax or irresponsible with our tenure review procedures at the college level or that we've appointed incompetent persons for cynical reasons—I certainly reject that outright, because that would be condemning myself and condemning all of you. You can see the folly of that, can't you? I think, perhaps, that we ought to address some of that concern next week. If the Provost would be willing to make any comments about that, I think it would help us quite a bit. So I do support the position of Mary Tabacchi and the others at the Hotel School, and we are very concerned about this—not so much the idea of tenure review by a University committee—but by the way this has been brought up at almost the last moment and that we're rushing to judgment on this. We may be providing a solution for a problem that doesn't exist when we ought to be providing a solution for one that does exist. And we could do that better, I think, with alternate mechanisms."

Speaker Obendorf: "It's been the tradition of this group to have the time for new business. I don't know whether we have anyone bringing new business forward today, though. So if we don't, I suppose we could have a few more comments on this issue."

Dean Stein: "I seem to detect a negative response. I'm not sure that I have it quite right, but that is what I seem to be hearing. We have scheduled a meeting next week, and I think we should do that. We need help, obviously; it's obvious that you don't like this position. And you could take the position that you don't like any proposal—that you're happy with the one we're following at the moment, where the Provost's committee of four is reviewing it and that you're happy with that. As someone who has always believed that the Faculty ought to run their own ship, that's somewhat disappointing to me. But if that's your will, that's what we'll do. But if you don't feel that way—if you feel that there is an appropriate way for faculty to play in this kind of critical decision, then you might try to think a little bit about how this role might be structured over the next week. We as a group—the University Faculty Committee—thought this was a good idea, but you clearly don't. Maybe there's another way, or another way of thinking about it, that you could help us with. If you really think this is a bad idea and that what you like is what we're doing now, you should say so and save all of us time. But I think that, by the rules, this is not the right place to make that statement."

Speaker Obendorf: "Well, it looks like we have an item of new business, so we'll switch to that and continue this discussion on the proposal for the University Faculty Committee on Tenure Appointments next week."

6. NEW BUSINESS

Professor Locksley Edmondson, Africana Studies and Research: "If I'm out of order, please rule me that way. I'm not going by any procedures, but I'm just curious to know what the purpose of the initial presentation by Trustee Calvo was all about. A presentation was made, and there was no opportunity for asking questions or discussing an issue that has rapped the Campus to the core over the last week. The presentation was based on very impressionistic, unscientific judgments and also on some false information—we were told that there would be a full debate with the Trustees, and then we were told that there would be no debate. It was based on a statement that a plan will not be put into effect until residences are approved. What was the purpose, may I ask, of the introduction of that issue, based on so many faulty statements?"

Professor Calvo: "Could I respond to that? I would like to take full responsibility for that. That sort of presentation was my own

idea; no one asked me to go about it in that way. I would look forward to an opportunity to discuss this further."

Professor Edmondson: "I must say that I began to worry when you said that 'one person said this,' 'nine were spoken to,' 'two people said this'; I really think that that was insensitive to what happened on Campus this past week. I do not know what to call this&endash;'old business,' 'new business'&endash;but I think I should make that statement on behalf of a concerned member of the Faculty. The Board of Trustees has only seen President Rawlings' plan, and they have seen no counter-proposal. So it's very unfair for you to introduce that, although I now understand that you wanted to alert us to something. I ask you, please, on our behalf, to refigure that approach."

Professor Corradino: "I would request that Professor Calvo actually distribute something in written form over the Web, perhaps on the Faculty Senate Web site, describing his comments along with his tables and figures. If it's important enough to bring up at this Senate meeting, it's important enough to include in the minutes."

Dean Stein: "Could I make just one announcement: The meeting next week will not be in this room, because next week is the middle of finals. The most convenient room we could find for a meeting is Bache Auditorium in Malott Hall. If you enter the building from Tower Road, go up the ramp and then go to your right."

Speaker Obendorf: "We need a motion for adjournment. [So moved] Well, then, we are adjourned."

Adjourned: 6:03 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Robert F. Lucey, Associate Dean and Secretary of the University Faculty