

# MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Wednesday, May 15, 1996

The Speaker pro tem, Professor Emeritus Russell D. Martin, Communication, called the meeting to order. He then called on Dean Stein for remarks.

## 1. REMARKS BY THE DEAN

Peter C. Stein, Dean of Faculty: "Well, we've been through a lot of rooms. I thought to myself when I first got here, 'What a nice room'—because I sat out there and looked around. But let me tell you: From down here, it doesn't look like a warm, friendly room. The reason we're in this room is because during finals week, there is essentially no free room at this hour. Between Tower Road and the Vet Campus, I think there were only this room and an auditorium that is no nicer in Martha Van Rensselaer; so we chose this room.

"This is a special meeting of the Senate that follows last week's meeting. And I'd like to talk just a little bit about my own views of last week's meeting, the future of the Senate, and the proposal that is before you today. I will formally introduce a proposal from the University Faculty Committee after finishing these remarks. The point of this period of time is to wait for a quorum; but I'd also like to give a personal perspective on faculty governance and offer some thoughts that occurred to me and the rest of the University Faculty Committee after last Wednesday's meeting.

"After last Wednesday's meeting, I thought a lot about the future of the Senate, faculty governance, what we should do and what we shouldn't do, what kinds of mistakes we've made, and how to go forth positively from here. Let me first say that, speaking for the University Faculty Committee, we were in absolute agreement that our judgment was wrong in bringing you a finished proposal at that particular time. Professors Lesser and Willett were correct in their assessment that it was too complex an issue to bring to you in the format that we brought it. Our hope for having resolution and that everyone would sort of be in consensus that the particular approach that we had chosen was the right approach, was an error in judgment. I don't think that it's necessary to apologize—though we obviously feel bad that we made that error—as we made it in good faith and did the best job that we could. I summed it up for myself by saying that complex issues require some brooding time before people can come to some kind of resolution. So, by the way, we will not put that proposal before you today. Instead, we will present another proposal which you may not understand—a lot of people did not really understand what we were trying to do through the e-mail message. So I'll try to explain that proposal a little more later on.

"One thing that I thought about a lot more than how we ought to make decisions about tenure appointments at the Provost's level was what the future of this organization was and how the Senate should be organized to have it fulfill its mission and to be the voice of the Faculty in decisions that are made at the central level. First, it's clear to me, both from the meeting last Wednesday and from a lot of things that many people have said, that we don't have our sea legs yet. We've got a new organization; we don't have a lot of experience; and we haven't quite figured out the right way to make it work. There are a lot of issues, and this is only the first in a series of complicated issues. I think we have not really settled on the right way to consider them and the right mixture of what sort of issues ought to come from the outside—the outside being the Administration—and what sort of issues ought to come from you. And we need to consider *how* the issues come from you and how we will consider issues that are complicated, like the one we presently have.

"I don't claim to have an answer to these questions. Later I'll have a proposal for another way to try, but we understand that we haven't figured out how to make this organization work. I say that with a sense of sadness but also with a sense of hope and purpose, because I think that this is really an historic moment. Faculty governance, in the past, has not worked. It has deteriorated. I've been here for a long time—maybe as long as anybody else in this room. And over that period of time, I certainly have seen a sense of deterioration on the part of the Faculty in the degree to which they believed that what they felt was the basis for decision-making at the central level. A long time ago, people felt pretty happy about that; more recently, people have not felt happy about that. And I've heard a lot in the past five to ten years about the growing gulf between the Faculty and Day Hall; so I've thought a lot about that. In my own mind, there are a number of reasons why that deterioration has occurred over the past several years and why faculty governance didn't work. I'll just tell you what I think the four major reasons are.

"First is the growing complexity of the Institution.

"A second is that we've become out of practice. We, I think, in a lot of ways—especially in the FCR—fell into what I call the 'Nancy Reagan' form of governance, which is, 'Just say no.' People laughed at people involved in faculty governance—not only here but elsewhere as well—as people who were incapable of doing anything else. The Administration came forward with a proposal on parking or on investments in South Africa or something else, and the Faculty

marched down in large numbers and made speeches against it and why they thought it was bad. So there was a resounding 'no'; but then they returned to their labs and classrooms and carrels in the library and said, 'Okay; we've now spoken. You may fix it up.' I think that is a form of governance that just plain doesn't work. In a small number of times, when the Administration has gone off in the wrong direction, that's a way for the Faculty to exert influence on an ongoing basis that doesn't work. In a certain sense, we have gone more and more into that way of thinking.

"A third reason for the deterioration of faculty governance is that we have lived through a relatively long period of expansion. In expansion, this might be the right way of operating, where mostly the answer from the Administration is 'yes' and not 'no.' In that sense, there may not really be a need for faculty governance.

"I hesitate, perhaps, to say the fourth out loud. But I've decided I will, because we need all the practice we can get in telling the truth. This pertains to the old watch of the Administration that preceded the current one. And I honestly believe, because they were people of good will, that they did not recognize it themselves—but I really think that in their hearts, they didn't want to have an effective faculty governance that channeled the way their thinking went regarding matters of how to run the University. I think they felt a certain amount of confidence that they knew what to do; so faculty governance was not something that was close to their hearts. Well, we live in a new era; things are different now. And although things are different, I think that, in a couple of ways, they are the same. I think we are still out of practice with regard to faculty governance, and I think that we're still a complex institution. Both of those things have not changed. But the two things that I believe have changed are, first, the era, and second, the Administration.

"The number that strikes me the strongest as being indicative of the fact that we are now a fundamentally different institution is that we used to make one hundred new appointments per year—or something of that order. And we now make roughly thirty new appointments per year. That is an enormous change. It's just hard to overestimate the effect of a change like that. It simply changes a whole lot of things about how we structure the Institution. This is not, as some people may assume, a momentary lapse; I don't believe we can assume that that number will ever be back to one hundred again. Thirty is our future, and I think that really demonstrates, in one way, a large number of forces that have impinged on our University. So we will have to learn to cope with it.

"And the second is the we have a new Administration; and I think that's important. I tend to be a skeptical person, and I'm skeptical about declarations of goodwill. But, nonetheless, I must tell you—again, I'm speaking honestly and telling you what I think—the current Administration is much more open and much more desirous of having effective, fundamental faculty input into the major shaping of the Institution and the future of the Institution. I think they are much more open to it, much more desirous of it, and much more understanding of the fact that it is important for them to make the right decisions to have a proper and effective faculty voice. I think they fundamentally desire it and that we have a unique opportunity—an opportunity that will not last forever. Either we make it work soon, or it isn't going to work at all. If we don't learn how to form that partnership with the new Administration in a constructive way—making these decisions together in a way that recognizes our mutual prerogatives, interests, skills, and capabilities—the opportunity for working together with them in a cooperative manner will disappear after a time. So I feel, personally, a certain amount of time pressure to make this thing work. I hope—I'd like to say I'm confident—but I'm cautiously optimistic that, in fact, together with the Administration, we can find an effective way for making this kind of partnership and cooperation work."

Speaker Martin: "Are there questions for the Dean? If not, I will again call on Dean Stein to introduce discussion on whether the University Faculty should play a formal role in tenure decisions at the level of the Provost's Office."

## **2. DISCUSSION ON WHETHER THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SHOULD PLAY A FORMAL ROLE IN TENURE DECISIONS AT THE LEVEL OF THE PROVOST'S OFFICE**

Dean Stein: "Okay, here I go again. As I said before, in my previous remarks, we agreed that it was not right to vote on a detailed proposal at this point without a whole lot more discussion and interaction from you. It's clear that you didn't like the last proposal, but what was not clear was how we could go about forming a proposal that you will like and that will answer whatever needs we have and will permit us to achieve some kind of consensus. We—the University Faculty Committee and I—thought about this, about what we should do at this point; and we came to the following way of formulating the question, which I hope you will be willing to answer. It is something like this: I listened to the whole meeting again that went on last Wednesday and tried to settle in my own mind what it is that you were saying, and it wasn't clear to me. I couldn't tell whether you were saying you just didn't like the proposal—that was clear—but I didn't hear any messages as to what you *did* like. Some people were saying, 'Yes, we ought to look at this, but we shouldn't do it in that way'; other people were saying, 'This is legitimate, but there are many flaws in the proposal'; and others were simply saying that we shouldn't get into this business at all. There was a whole spectrum of views going on.

"One possibility is that we shouldn't get into this business at all&endash;the Faculty has no role to create a new system and is happy with the way things are being done regarding tenure at the present time. We should just move on to other issues. We are, of course, your servants. I and the University Faculty Committee try to represent your views. If that's what you think, we drop this, and we go on to something else.

"If you think that we ought to be thinking about this issue in some way&endash;and there is a variety of different frameworks of how we could interact with the Provost regarding making appointments at his level&endash;then we came up with the following way of dealing with the issues: We would have in the fall a half-day session of the Senate devoted to this particular issue. This was inspired by something called the Academic Leadership Series (ALS) that some of you may have participated in; but I have myself been skeptical of the ALS. Now, it has a lot of good things going for itself. It's a way that people can get together and talk about complicated issues in small groups; and, in principle, it gives the mechanism for finding some sort of consensus. The problem with the ALS, from my point of view, is that it never went anywhere. They never came out with any type of solution, and it gave the appearance of being controlled by some outside forces. But it seemed to us that we could structure something that would be similar yet different. Suppose we got all of us together and heard presentations from different groups on different ways of looking at this problem in plenary sessions; afterward, we would break up into small groups of seven or eight people and sit around to talk together&endash;someone would take notes&endash;and try to come to a consensus. Then we'd correlate these notes, and the University Faculty Committee, in its role as Executive Committee, could figure out whether they saw consensus in these views; and then they could perhaps make a proposal out of all of this, charge a committee to make a proposal from this, or something like that. Then they could bring that proposal to this group for debate and amendment and adoption. That seemed like a way that there would be sufficient time to hear the arguments that people make and also sufficient opportunity for each of you to offer your two cents about what's good or bad about it or whatever.

"So, if you say we ought to stay in this issue, that would be our proposal: We would try to organize something like this early in the fall semester. The insistence would be that after that one meeting we would come up with some sort of plan that we would either vote up or down or amend so that something would be accomplished. If you say 'yes,' that's how we think we'd like to proceed. If you say 'no,' we'll drop it and talk about the next thing. That's the proposal; and I'm offering this as a motion."

Speaker Martin: "Is there discussion?"

Professor Emeritus Donald F. Holcomb, Physics: "I'd like to direct this to the Dean, who I think has gotten too much angst over last week's meeting. I personally thought that last week's meeting was a somewhat disorderly triumph for this body. We dealt with an important issue where there were many points of view&endash;obviously many of them contradictory&endash;and we found that the University Faculty Committee had attacked an important issue, gotten involved in trying to put together something in response to it, and brought it forward. It was an issue that people had thought a lot about, but the Senate decided that you had started off and gone down the wrong track. Well, let's get back to it and deal with that important issue. I really don't think that one should take that debate as a sign that this body is deficient. I thought it was a triumph of this body. Personally, I feel that this issue is indeed one that we should deal with, for the benefit of the University, the Provost, and the President&endash;not, in some limited way, for the Faculty. The issue of standards across the University&endash;defining them and making sure we live up to them&endash;is in our interests as well as everyone else's, and I think we need a mechanism to do it. It's clear that we need to take several proposals, turn them against one another, and see how everything comes out."

Isaac Kramnick, Richard J. Schwartz Professor of Government: "May I ask the Dean: Will this become a precedent? When important issues come before this body, will we always have to have a half-day retreat where we talk about them?"

Dean Stein: "I sure hope not."

Professor Kramnick: "It might well be taken as such a precedent."

Dean Stein: "I can't see us doing more than one of these a year, but I think it might be a mode for attacking something complicated. We haven't had a lot of experience in doing construction&endash;and by that, I mean devising a new procedure&endash;in faculty governance for some time. It seemed to me that this might be a way to try to attack it and see how it works."

Professor Kramnick: "But surely we can't operate on such an ad-hoc fashion, having a half-day session to see if we could clarify what we couldn't clear up in our regular meetings."

Professor William H. Lesser, Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics: "Dean Stein, one of the things I came away with from our meeting last week was one of the reasons why there seemed to be such a mix of opinions and viewpoints. It wasn't particularly clear as to what the underlying issues we were attempting to address really were. The proposal dealt with the question of whether the Faculty should have additional input in the Provost's decisions on tenure appointments. That's one point. But what you said about having only thirty appointments per year&endash;there's another issue regarding those who get tenured. Should we

be additionally careful about tenure decisions in that environment? I think we really need to consider which issue it is. We say 'issue,' but what issue are we dealing with? And what's the best approach to resolve the matter? I think that's part of the underlying disagreement."

Associate Professor Philippe C. Baveye, Soil, Crop, and Atmospheric Sciences: "I think this body would miss a unique opportunity if we focused only on the question that Dean Stein has raised. The question about the Administration is the following: Does the Provost want to have much more input or say in the tenure and promotion decision than perhaps in the past? And does he want the Senate or certain faculty members to back him up? Isn't the question that we should be considering, is what is the role the Provost should be playing in the process of promotion to tenure? Is what he considers his prerogative really what the Faculty considers to be his prerogative? In other words, should tenure and promotion decisions be made preferentially at the college level, with minor input from the Provost and the President only in extreme cases?"

Assistant Professor Tony Simons, Hotel Administration: "I'd like to amplify some of the points that other people have made. What was offered last time was a rather complete approach—a solution. And what you're doing this time is offering us a solution, only this time it's more vague. The question is whether the Faculty should have input at the Provost's level. But I still haven't seen a clear statement of what, exactly, the problem is. I think we should probably have a discussion of that before we try to vote on solutions. I've heard a few things proposed: One is the concern of diversity of standards within the University; I've heard the question of whether faculty should have input on tenure decisions in other departments and the question of whether that's a problem; there's the issue that eighty percent of our faculty are already tenured—with an implication that, perhaps, too many of them are tenured; finally, there's the question of whether there is concern that Cornell has become lax when awarding tenure. I'd like to see discussion of the underlying problem, and then we can talk about solutions."

Dean Stein: "It was just those questions that were raised that led me to think that a longer session with a more open set-up for discussion was the right way to look at this. I would hope that part of that half-day session would be devoted to an exposition as to what people see as the problem. Why is it that we are talking about this? What are the reasons? Then, having laid that out, what are possible solutions?"

Professor Simons: "But what drove this proposal that stirred all this up? What is the original problem to which the proposal was the solution?"

Dean Stein: "The problem to which the proposal was a solution was that the Provost was feeling that there ought to be a closer scrutiny of tenure appointment decisions, and he asked the Faculty to become involved in it. That's where it came from. It would be good, in an open meeting, to have a fuller discussion of it. Does that make sense? Is there a problem?"

Associate Professor Robert A. Corradino, Vet Physiology: "I'd just like to add that the problem in all of this is defining this. I would like to see the Provost offer a declaration of what he sees as a mechanism for ensuring excellence across Campus, in the College of Arts and Sciences, in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, and in all the other colleges. What is the problem, as he sees it? A written declaration could be read and responded to in a logical manner."

Associate Professor Jeffrey G. Scott, Entomology: "I'd like to follow up on some of these comments. What is this trying to fix? The Provost asked for this but didn't say why, leaving us with a proposal that had too complex a solution without any clear, underlying issues to be addressed. He didn't say that our tenure rate is too high or that one college is sending him terrible packages and he wanted some input to back himself up. He didn't give any indication at all as to why we should be thinking about these issues, and I think we do need, as Professor Corradino stated, an indication from him regarding what he wants us to fix.

"I would like to digress from that for a moment to disagree, Dean Stein, with your opening remarks. I think this body works well. You may suggest that we're too pessimistic, but I would suggest that perhaps the proposals we get don't warrant unqualified optimism. This body has voted on a number of resolutions: The grade resolution, for example, was passed. So we are not voting down everything. And I would have to respectfully disagree: I think this body *does* work. And if our votes are predominately negative, I think that may be more a reflection of the materials that we are given and asked to change—rather than the fact that we all are a bunch of . . . whatever."

Associate Professor Lois S. Willett, Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics: "I'd like to follow up this discussion a bit by saying that if we have further discussion on this issue, I think it's critical to define the problem before we continue on. If there is a half-day meeting in the fall without any definition of the problem prior to that meeting, my thoughts are that it will be a wasted meeting."

Dean Stein: "I totally agree with you."

Professor Terrence L. Fine, Electrical Engineering: "I agree with Professor Holcomb's opening remarks about the excess of angst

here. My own understanding of this is that maybe if there is a problem, it's that we're trying to lead this group too much from the front. I think that we do not seem to develop these resolutions ourselves, and then we have to vote them up or down or perhaps modify them slightly. I don't think that's a sign that this organization is malfunctioning. I'm not so sure about the complexity of the situation, though that's been one of the issues of debate today. The other one is excellence. After last week's meeting, I thought about the numbers involved—the Provost turned back one out of forty and perhaps questioned two or three others. It's clear to me that that is not an excellence issue—not at those numbers. If there were a problem with excellence, the numbers would be much higher, more than two or three. This is an issue, really, of minimum standards. If it is such an issue, then I think I'd address the problem in a different way rather than by having faculty committees look at everything. If that is the issue, then I'm certainly willing to hear it defined. It may well be enough for the Provost to do what a provost should: Set academic standards, inform the deans and chairs as to what these standards are, and, in case an occasional mistake is made, correct it. He gets advice from many levels, as it is now. If it's beyond that—if it is more than that issue—then let's see it defined."

Professor Kenneth A. Strike, Education: "I guess I lack a good context to respond very successfully to the resolution before us. It depends on what I envision as the alternative to it. If the alternative to having faculty have input at the University level is a fairly activist role of the Provost, exercised independently from any advisory function of the Faculty, I'm rather opposed to that, and I would very much like to have faculty have some input. On the other hand, it seems to me that the real tradition around here has been to have tenure decisions made de facto at the department or college level, and I would also understand a higher-level involvement of the Faculty at the University level, replacing, essentially, a more college-oriented system in which the Provost merely exercises judgment when things go egregiously wrong. Now I have very different reactions as to whether I want more faculty input at the University level, depending on what it is I think is the consequence of that—and what it is I think is the alternative to that. I also find now that how I vote on this has something to do with whether or not I have to go to a half-day meeting in the fall, which further confuses my judgment. [Laughter] The facetious remark is connected, however, with a more serious one about how this body functions. I'm not sure whether or not we've done a good job sorting things out. But it does strike me that legislative bodies that are successful need some sort of more differentiated internal systems for venting proposals, thinking about them, considering them at length over a period of time—in what's generally referred to as a 'committee system' and in which there is generally more than one of the same. It seems to me that if everything that is going to come before this body is to be vented by a single committee, that will stress the time and the expertise of a single group of individuals. Before we begin to deal with complex issues of university governance on a systematic basis, we need to develop some sort of internal organization that will allow us to do that more successfully."

Professor Peter J. Trowbridge, Landscape Architecture: "These topics have represented department-wide views in the Department of Landscape Architecture. First, given the motion on the floor, we're in full support of having more faculty involved in the tenure review process. However, listening very carefully last time to the proposal on the floor, I think that many of the professional schools which we heard from felt that standing committees would not serve the University Faculty at-large very well. I heard not a lot of confusion, but I was hearing certain things that were repeated. One was that the lineal process of department to dean to Day Hall—the lineal process was a very divisive one that is very confusing and very protracted. In response, I guess, to the motion, we would say, 'Yes, more faculty support would be nice.' But as a recommendation to the committee and to this body, we'd like to see Day Hall and the deans have a much closer relationship rather than duplicate efforts of having double committees, it would be worthwhile for the deans of the colleges and the Provost to have collectively one committee that would reduce redundancy and speed up time. That same committee, then, would give advice to both bodies. It wouldn't be duplicative; it wouldn't be redundant; it wouldn't be divisive. In fact, it would be a singular set of advice; and both parties could participate in selecting that committee. Both could be equally invested in that process. Subsequently, both would hear the advice and base their individual decisions on that. So I not only support the motion on the floor but feel that there could be a much more streamlined, much less administrative, much less lineal and divisive process to make this happen—and to make things happen quickly."

Assistant Professor Lily H. Chi, Architecture: "I appreciate Dean Stein's proposal for a longer discussion on this matter regarding how the Faculty might get involved in these decisions, but I would have difficulty voting on the motion put forward today, because I see the option of the Faculty getting involved as one option among others—and this really, then, rests on the question of what is at issue. I'm wondering if this vote on whether the Faculty should be involved could be deferred until after that general discussion."

Dean Stein: "Sure."

Mary Beth Norton, Mary Donlon Alger Professor of American History: "I'd like to respond to the comments by Professor Strike and Professor Trowbridge. I think that Professor Trowbridge raised a very interesting idea, and that would be just the sort of thing we should talk about at this meeting in the fall, should we decide to have it. But with respect to Professor Strike, let me comment that I think the Provost has made very clear that, indeed, he is going to be more active than provosts traditionally have been. That is certainly what I understood him to say to the Faculty Senate last Wednesday; and it's certainly an extension of what he's said at meetings with him of the University Faculty Committee. In my mind, the alternative, in fact, to adopting this motion (although, if we wanted to defer it until the fall, that's another issue) is, indeed, to see a continuing activism on the part of the Provost in this regard,

without input from the Faculty&endash;other than the people who the Provost picks to assist him. At the moment, those are three other top administrators. So, I think that the alternative, as far as I am concerned, is clear.

"With your second issue on the question of the structure of this body, this is something that has, in fact, been discussed by the University Faculty Committee. As people may or may not be aware, what's happened is that the FCR committee structure has been incorporated in some strange way into the Faculty Senate; but that has not been fully integrated yet. One thing the University Faculty Committee has started talking about&endash;precisely because we don't want to draft every proposal that comes before this body&endash;is to establish genuine committee structures from the members of the Senate. That would mean, of course, more meetings for all of us&endash;not just for members of the University Faculty Committee. So, I mean, everybody has to keep that in mind. But that is, in fact, the way we ought to go."

Seymour Smidt, Nicholas H. Noyes Professor of Economics and Finance, Johnson Graduate School of Management: "Unfortunately, I missed the last meeting; so I haven't benefited from all of that discussion. But it seems to me that what we have going on here is a fundamental change in the way the University is being led administratively. Of course, Cornell has immense diversity; and I thought that people would view that as a real strength of the University. The real power of this University, in the time I've been here, has been at the level of the schools. It has not been in Day Hall. When I describe Cornell to my colleagues at other institutions, I say that this is not an organization. This is a feudal society with a weak king and strong knights. In many cases, the deans of the various schools are much stronger than the Central Administration. It has its problems, however. It's certainly not very deep. The range of activities that we do does not have any logical sense, perhaps; but it seems to work. Cornell is a better place today, certainly, than it was three or four decades ago. It may not work for the future, though. Members of the Administration in Day Hall have to reconsider what their roles are and what our roles are. This debate is, I think, just a symptom. If they can control the faculty tenure without a broad look at the whole unit that is being involved, that doesn't seem, to me, to make any sense. There are units in which fundamental positions are subject to change. It would have been inconceivable to me ten years ago if somebody had said the State might withdraw support from some of the colleges here. But that's not inconceivable today. Since this proposal can control that at the level of tenure without a broad look at the whole picture doesn't make any sense at all. Before we talk about the procedure, I think we need to talk about the fundamentals. Where is the leadership going to come from? Is Cornell going to continue to be a decentralized organization with Day Hall providing everything or nothing? Or is it going to become a centralized organization, which is a very different structure than we've had for years?"

Professor Frederick M. Ahl, Classics: "I think one of the main difficulties that we're all facing is that many of us are unfamiliar with one another. There are, since people are very individualistic on the faculty, as many opinions on the faculty as there are individual people. And what we're doing at these meetings is spending a great deal of time discovering the degree of individuality that prevails in terms of ideas and opinions on a complex subject. This is one of the reasons why I find that Dean Stein's suggestion of some mechanism of getting us together in smaller groups for discussion, whereby we can, in fact, discover more about one another, may be a very productive affair. I think we could end up spending many more general meetings trying to figure out who we are, what our interests are, and who are constituencies are. I think this is something that is very much missing now. We could, presumably, have the differences in opinion addressed by virtually every member of the Senate here&endash;and anyone else who cares to make an impression. One of the first things we really need to do is to get together in smaller groups and find out who we are and what common ideas we may have regarding this issue of faculty governance. So I will certainly encourage members of the Senate to think about trying to get together in, perhaps, even random groups rather than colleges speaking en bloc&endash;so that people do find out what the differences of opinion are and what the problems are and how we can address them. Each speaker who stands up and says something is pointing out a different angle from one that I had thought about or heard about earlier. I think this is what we must get in order before we can really get things in gear to try to achieve a consensus of individuals. If we spend all our time simply quibbling over details here and details there, we are going to end up making the whole Senate a dysfunctional body. What I think has been achieved is that we've at least established that there are multiple opinions here. But I think that we now have to find a way to organize them, sort them, and group them."

Dean Stein: "I'd like to respond to a number of people. First is my declaration of angst. My angst was not at the fact that this body clearly rejected what the University Faculty Committee brought forward. I didn't say, 'Bad Senate!' for rejecting what the UFC brought forward. (I may think that, but I certainly didn't say that.) [Laughter] What really bothers me is the fact that we could have gotten so out of sync. This proposal came to you unanimously from a committee that was elected broadly by the whole Faculty. That is what I was trying to think about. How will we find a way to have the committees that will make proposals and the UFC, which is supposed to act as a liaison between the Provost and you and you and your departments&endash;how does that whole thing work if we've gotten so out of step with the rest of the group? That's the source of my angst. I accept your verdict on that proposal. I don't argue. You were right; it was no good; end of story. But the question is, 'How do we go about getting a proposal that will achieve consensus?'

"As for Lily Chi's comment, a 'yes' on this vote, to my mind, would not answer that question. The 'yes' on this proposal is simply your permission to go ahead and try to find this new mechanism for generating a proposal that we can all sign on to. As for the

people who want to know what the problem is, right on. That is how I think this meeting ought to open—with a frank and open discussion of what the problem is and what we are trying to do. I think that's too hard to do in this constrained setting with these time limits. So, all of those things, in my mind, speak toward this proposal that we're laying on the table.

"And the last thing, to Professor Strike: There have been three substantive motions that have been voted on by this body. One was the proposal we just brought you; another was the sexual harassment procedures; and the other was the median grade proposal. Now, the other two came from committees of this body. The median grade proposal and the sexual harassment proposal went through a committee structure. So it isn't true that everything goes through the University Faculty Committee, it was just this one proposal."

Professor James W. Gillett, Natural Resources: "I strongly urge support of this, because it gives us time to develop some data that we don't have about this problem. We'll be able to develop data on promotion and tenure evaluation—and that hasn't been done yet. It would be good to gather information on our experiences at other universities and what others have told us about what is, really, a serious issue."

Professor Trowbridge: "Just a response, I think, to Peter's comments: It seems to me that the committees that bring recommendations to this body might want to hear ideas from the body prior to bringing their recommendations to the floor. I think that they may be well served by that process. Otherwise, considering the way the recommendation was brought to us last time, I might as well have sat in my office and voted electronically."

Professor Howard C. Howland, Neurobiology and Behavior (At-large): "I think the reason we're in the dilemma we are is that we've gotten two different messages from the Administration. One, as brought to us by Professor Norton, is that the Provost says he's going to exert much more scrutiny on tenure appointments. At the same time, we heard from the Provost at the last meeting, when he stated—in response, I believe, to a question from the floor—that his turning back of one of, say, forty proposals was not anything exceptional. So I think that's the real problem we're facing."

"I'd like to make one comment about the failure of this motion at the last meeting. I certainly share Professor Holcomb's belief that that was a really good meeting; I think the Senate really spoke well. Possibly together with this 'retreat,' as it were, and not having to have a retreat for every big question that comes up—I think that if that proposal in, perhaps, a draft or tentative form had been e-mailed to all of the Senators and we were asked for our opinions—say, we were given a couple days to talk with our departments and get back to Dean Stein—the Dean and the UFC would have known right off not to bring it to the floor."

"Lastly, I would like to mention my own anxiety here. . . ."

Dean Stein: "That's *angst*."

Professor Howland: [In German] "Thank you, Professor." [Laughter] [Resuming in English] "That is, we have been going through downsizing, and different colleges have handled this in different ways. It came up at the last meeting that there was some worry on the part of the Administration that colleges would bring forward tenure appointments simply to maintain the line. I responded to that and didn't think that was likely. But since then I've found that some colleges, at least, are freezing tenure-track lines. That is, if someone fails to get tenure, then that line gets frozen. But I'd like you to know that that's not universal. The college that's undergone the greatest shrinking in the last five years is the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences—but they have never frozen or lost a tenure line. That's not true for all colleges. That's not true for Engineering, for example: Engineering lost twenty positions, and they froze and stopped appointments everywhere. I hope it's not going to be true in the College of Arts and Sciences. And that's why, under 'new business,' I will make this motion that I've brought with me today."

Speaker Martin: "Are you clear as to the motion on the floor? Dean Stein, would you restate it?"

Professor Corradino: "I have it written right here."

Speaker Martin: "Would you please read it, then."

Professor Corradino: "Should the University Faculty play a formal role in tenure decisions at the level of the Provost's Office?"

Professor Kramnick: "A point of information: Does a vote 'yes' require us to have a half-day session? If we do, will the Dean explain how we explain this to our students."

Dean Stein: "With your unanimous permission, I would like to change the motion to say, 'Shall the Senate continue its investigation into the role that the Faculty should play in the tenure appointments at a central level?' That's really what's meant by it. So, if no one objects, I would like to transform that."

Professor Kramnick: "Again, if we vote 'yes,' will we have the half-day retreat? Or may we separate the questions?"

Dean Stein: "You'd like to separate the questions? Okay."

Professor Simons: "May I speak to the proposal? If we invoke some kind of faculty involvement at the Provost's level, we're talking about some sort of committee. I would just like to raise a concern—recognizing that I am an involved party, as I am an untenured faculty member. If we assembled committees of faculty from different schools, what will be triggered are scripts or routines—and the routine that will be elicited is that the committee is making tenure decisions. Consequently, in order to feel useful, each committee will feel that they have to turn down someone among the people whom they are taken to review, whether it is five or whether it is ten. And that will result in a larger proportion than the one in thirty or forty that was shot down by the Provost. Also, if the Provost is reserving the right to override the committee's decision, then, in fact, we are not replacing the Provost's decision with a University Faculty decision; we are, in fact, adding another hurdle. I just wanted to make clear what people are voting for."

Speaker Martin: "If there are no objections, we shall vote."

Professor P.C.T. de Boer, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering: "This is not an objection, but if the Speaker would like to close off debate, he should ask for a motion for the previous question."

Speaker Martin: "If there are no objections, we shall close debate and vote. Hearing no objections, the previous question passes. Thank you, Professor de Boer. We're now dividing the motion. Would you like to restate the first part, Dean Stein?"

*Resolve that the Senate shall continue its investigation into the question as to whether the Faculty should play some role in decision-making on tenure at the central level.*

Speaker Martin: "Okay. All in favor, say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'; it is carried. Now we will vote on the second half, regarding the half-day session."

Professor Kramnick: "Could the Dean explain this motion? Would it be on a weekday or a weekend, for example?"

Dean Stein: "The motion is that we devote a half-day, sometime early in the fall term, with unspecified parameters—that means I'm not saying 9:00 to 12:00, and I'm not saying Monday or Saturday or before registration or after, because we haven't talked about it at all—to devote an extended period of time for looking into all of the issues that have been raised on this floor regarding this particular motion, with a view to coming to some kind of conclusion. Possibly other topics will be discussed as well. The format is, at the moment, as free as that."

Assistant Professor Mark Cruvellier, Architecture: "Could I offer a point of clarification? It seems that everything is vague but the following: Is the intent that after this half-day meeting, the results will go back to the UFC and the UFC will draft some new proposal? Or could that end conclusion be open as well?"

Dean Stein: "That conclusion could certainly be left open, as far as I am concerned. It has not been thought through. The only thing that has been thought through is to have a large block of time and to break up into smaller groups to be able to discuss the problems—and to have presentations as to what the problems are and what some solutions are. That's what we talked about, and that's what we're proposing."

Professor Scott: "This would occur after we've received something from the Provost indicating what he believes the problem is?"

Dean Stein: "It is my hope that preceding this meeting, we could distribute to you written documents from various people—and I can make no promises for anything, though—which might be a definition of the problem and some possible solutions for it. But I would like to give you something to bite on so you have something to think about in advance of the meeting. I don't have a written proposal—that's obvious. But what I'm building on is what went on in the Academic Leadership Series. I'm hoping we can come out with a real solution, or real understanding, and be able to bring all our thoughts to bear and come out with something we can all sign on to. One thing this sort of thing requires is some preparation: You can't come in cold to something like this, so there have to be papers distributed. I can't promise anything except to try to make it productive."

Speaker Martin: "We're running short of time. Are these points of information?"

Professor Gary A. Rendsburg, Near Eastern Studies: "I don't know if you'd call it a 'point of information,' but I would like to raise the same question for which we still don't have an answer. In other words, my vote here is very much dependent on whether I'm going to go into this meeting, whenever it might be, being asked to, first, determine what the problem is and then determine what the

solution to the problem is—or, will we have a document in front of us, from the Provost, detailing what the problem is so that we can, then, look for a solution? That's a crucial issue which I still haven't heard an answer for."

Dean Stein: "I'm going to give it my best, Gary. I understand what you are saying, and I will try. I can't speak for the Provost, but I see his hand raised."

Don M. Randel, Provost: "Yes. Don Randel, Department of Music. [Laughter] Alas, I think it is, in some degree, up to the Faculty to decide whether there is a problem. The University Bylaws say that the President recommends to the Board of Trustees the promotion to tenure of faculty. The University Bylaws are not subject to amendment by the University Faculty. The agenda of the Board of Trustees says: 'The President recommends that Professor So-and-So be elected. . . .' The President, being a responsible person, tries to make that a serious recommendation and asks the Provost to advise him. I came into the office simply intending to exercise my responsibilities appropriately. Seeing a range of cases, I think anyone in this room would be bound to conclude that the range was quite considerable. I made what seemed to be a responsible judgment. I'm perfectly happy to continue to carry on in that way, because I think I do exercise my responsibilities as honestly as I can, and I have some colleagues who do it with me. But there was a considerable sense within the Faculty, I judged, that somehow, by definition, members of the Central Administration somehow cannot do right by exercising their judgment. It was in response to what I perceived to be the opinions of some members of the Faculty that I began to speak with Dean Stein about the degree to which it would be useful to have a mechanism in which the Provost (or whatever designee the President chooses) could be advised about this. You should understand that the responsibility will always lie, ultimately, with the President. To that end, there is no appeal to that judgment. But, a provost will find it very difficult to turn down a case that is presented to him or her from a faculty committee that is set up for the purposes of maintaining the Faculty's own standards. The responsibility will always remain in the hands of the President, however. If it is the judgment of the Faculty that I was wrong in perceiving that there was some dissatisfaction with the current arrangement, in which I and the infamous 'gang of four' make decisions to the best of our ability, then the Faculty can, in fact, decide that they do not wish to have any further mechanism. I have since heard some faculty members say that they'd rather take their chances with me and the gang of four than with a committee of their own making. I found some irony in this, but I am perfectly willing to accept this.

"To return to the original point, I think that it is, in fact, the Faculty that has to decide whether there is a problem and how it wishes to address it. If, in fact, it is the sense of this group that doing things the way we're doing them is okay, then that's fine with me. And what we will try to do is what we have thus far tried to do: We'll look at the range of cases that comes before us and make a reasoned judgment as to whether they all, in fact, represent, in some common way, the standards to which we all aspire. I should say that I don't wish to debate whether we can define 'excellence,' either. I think that was one of the least productive parts of last week's meeting. We won't be able to do that to anyone's satisfaction in any way that will be useful. Sensible people will try to make a sensible judgment."

Speaker Martin: "We have far exceeded the time allotted to this matter, and we have other business to come before the body."

Professor Kramnick: "This motion has not been discussed. I would like to persuade my colleagues to vote against it. We are setting a dangerous precedent. Whenever we have a difficult issue, you are suggesting that we cannot have a meeting at 4:30 for two successive weeks, but we must take a half-day out of teaching to have a retreat. This will be constantly looked back on, and we will say, 'Well, we did it on that issue. Let's have a retreat.' I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion."

Speaker Martin: "Okay, if there are no objections, we will vote."

Professor de Boer: "I move to postpone indefinitely."

Speaker Martin: "There's been a motion to postpone this matter indefinitely. Is there a second?"

Professor Corradino: "I'll second it."

Dean Stein: "Do we all understand this motion?"

Professor de Boer: "A motion to postpone a matter indefinitely is not amendable but is debatable, and it means that the proposal would be defeated for this session—it cannot come up again at this meeting. The reason that I'm moving it is that I don't think it is a good motion—we don't really know what to do; but on the other hand, I don't think I want to defeat it directly. I respect very much the intent of the motion, but I think that at this time, it isn't properly formulated."

Speaker Martin: "It has been seconded. Is there further discussion on the motion to postpone indefinitely?"

Dean Stein: "I think that you ought to either turn it up or turn it down. We thought about this thing, and we thought it was a good way of proceeding to examine this motion, and I think you ought to give us a 'yes' or 'no' vote on it. I don't really see the point of

that parliamentary maneuver."

Speaker Martin: "Further discussion? If not, all in favor of postponing this motion indefinitely&ndash;which means it cannot come up again at this meeting&ndash;say 'aye'; opposed, 'no.' The Chair is in doubt; we will take a standing vote. Only Senators are permitted to vote. All in favor of the motion, please stand. Thank you. All opposed, please stand. Thank you. This was a point of how loud the voices were. The motion is defeated by a vote of 46 to 20. We are now back to the motion itself."

Dean Stein: "I move the question."

Speaker Martin: "Is there a second?" [Seconded] "All in favor of the previous question&ndash;ceasing debate and voting&ndash;please say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'; it is carried. We will now take a vote on the motion. Would the Dean please care to repeat it before we vote."

Dean Stein: "The motion authorizes the University Faculty Committee to prepare for a half-day session early in the fall semester to discuss the issue of faculty involvement in tenure appointments at the University level&ndash;plus other issues that they wish to raise that will address all of the questions that have been raised on this floor."

Speaker Martin: "Is that clear? All in favor, please say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'; the motion is defeated."

Professor Norton: "Division, please."

Speaker Martin: "Okay, we will take a standing vote. All in favor of the motion, please stand. You may sit. All opposed, please stand. Thank you. The motion is defeated by a vote of 30 to 40."

Professor Howland: "May I ask a question of the Provost, who was out of the room when I made an interpretation which involved what he said last time? What happened was that at the beginning here, it was voiced that we didn't really know what the question was we were trying to solve. I floated the proposal that the reason we didn't know was because Professor Norton had conveyed your opinion&ndash;or your statement&ndash;that you were going to scrutinize tenure appointment cases much more carefully than had been done in the past at the Provost's level. And then I said that that seemed to be a contradiction to what you said at the open assembly last time, when you said what you had done in turning a tenure appointment back was nothing out of the ordinary. I said that I felt that that was what led to the confusion. And since I said that while you were out of the room, I felt I should say that with you in the room."

Provost Randel: "Actually, I was in the room when you said that. One's perspective depends on one's interpretation of the past. When I was a witness like you, I looked at things differently. Part of the difficulty that divides us is that there is a difference of opinion about how seriously this has been done in the past. If you were to ask Don Cooke, Bob Barker, or Mal Nesheim what they did, they would tell you that they looked at these things seriously. And indeed, last year, the same four people were doing this, except for me. Mal wrote letters to college deans saying, 'If I get another one like this, I'll turn it down.' He never did, in fact, turn one down, but he certainly made it clear that he was prepared to do that. That could lead to an interpretation that what I propose to do isn't any different from what has ever been done. So, leaving aside that point, all I can assert is that I propose to take seriously the responsibility that the President gives me. If you think that's different from the past, fine. If you think that's not different from the past, fine also. All I'm saying is that I believe I will continue to exercise that office to the best of my ability. The office has always entailed the responsibility to review tenure cases."

Professor Corradino: "I have a question for the Provost. With all due respect, is it too much to ask that you define what you consider to be appropriate standards for promotion to tenure? I don't mean you have to do it right now, but I'd actually like to see something in written form, so that we know, as faculty, what you're looking for. You must have something in mind; Vice President Ehrenberg certainly did last week."

Provost Randel: "Sure, I have something in mind. And so does every department and every dean&ndash;and that is not the same thing as saying it can be codified in so many words in a way that the effect could be found satisfying. I could clearly produce some descriptive language that would speak of 'high this' and 'distinguished that'; but I don't think it would get us very far. I don't think we need more rules about this. I think we need to look at these packages of things that come along and ask, 'Do they seem to represent similar standards, or is there too great diversity in them?' Then we should make the decisions accordingly."

Speaker Martin: "We have another item of business coming up, so this better be relevant."

Professor Simons: "I'd like to make a general motion. I might be off base, but it might cut through some of the general confusion. Provost Randel proposed that the problem we were trying to address was faculty discontent with his exercise of power over this past year, where he turned down something of the order of one in forty tenure appointments. I'm wondering whether we might

want to get a sense of the body as to whether the Faculty is discontent with that exercise of power. We don't have to do it, though."

Speaker Martin: "I'm sorry, but we are out of time. The chair calls on Professor Elizabeth Earle, for a message from Trustee Calvo."

### **3. RESOLUTION AND DISCUSSION OF WAYS TO MAKE THE FACULTY SENATE AND THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEE REPRESENT THE FACULTY MORE EFFECTIVELY**

Professor Elizabeth D. Earle, Plant Breeding and Biometry: "I've been asked to read a statement by Trustee Joe Calvo, who could not be here in person because he is giving an exam. So I will read his statement."

The University Senate should be the education arm of the faculty with respect to important university issues. Indeed, part of the rationale for adopting our new structure for faculty governance was the possibility of bringing these issues to faculty members in individual departments. During these first months in the life of the University Senate, it is important that procedures be established that support this role of the Senate as the education arm of the faculty.

I see two major problems in realizing this aspect of our mission. First, the extent to which individual Senators report to their colleagues on issues brought before the Senate undoubtedly varies widely. The faculty of some department may not meet on a regular basis, and the agendas of scheduled meetings may not allow time for adequate discussion of issues taken up by the Senate. The second problem has to do with the ability of Senators to adequately convey the pros and cons of issues to their colleagues, sometimes weeks after the issues have been discussed. Sometimes the advantages of a proposal or resolution are laid out in a written summary, but it is not usually the case that disadvantages or alternatives are included in such a written summary. Is it reasonable to expect a Senator to synthesize a balanced and accurate summary of the pros and cons of an issue after attending one or a few meetings and perhaps after reading the minutes of those meetings? No one would question the ability of Senators to do so, but how many have the time?

I request that the University Faculty Committee consider how to structure Senate procedures so as to enhance the education function of the Senate. At a minimum, I would hope for a requirement that proposals deemed to be exceptionally important to the faculty have written descriptions of both advantages and disadvantages and that they contain a description of alternatives to the proposal.

Professor Earle: "That is Joe Calvo's statement."

Speaker Martin: "Okay, we have seven minutes for discussion. At five minutes before six o'clock, the Speaker will call for new business. The floor is now open for discussion of Trustee Calvo's message."

Ronald L. Breiger, Goldwin Smith Professor of Sociology: "I believe that the message is relevant to some of the concerns that have been vexing us with respect to the ability of the University Faculty Committee to put forward a proposal that would have wide support. We are in a bit of a conundrum, because we voted that the Faculty Senate should continue its consideration of the issue of faculty involvement in tenure decisions at the Provost's level, but we've decided not to pursue this particular half-day plan. It goes along with the educational functions of the Senate and our representatives on the University Faculty Committee to suggest that one way out of our conundrum might be to ask the Dean of the Faculty to call upon volunteers to be on a committee that would work with the University Faculty Committee and would, in particular, contain representatives of the professional schools, which were, in my observation, a source of much discontent over the proposal as presented last time. From this set of volunteers working with the University Faculty Committee, a proposal could be returned to the Senate that would deal with faculty involvement in tenure decisions at the Provost's level."

Professor Barry K. Carpenter, Chemistry: "I wonder if one idea might be to set up a Senate electronic bulletin board, to which only Senators could post things&endash;by way of a password&endash;but which anybody in the University could read. It seems to me that such an amendment might address some of the issues that Dean Stein and the University Faculty Committee were trying to address in this meeting. But it would have the advantage that people could access this information at a time that is convenient to them."

Assistant Professor Linda K. Nicholson, Biochemistry, Molecular and Cell Biology (At-large): "I would like to make a motion that we pursue this type of idea and have a structured mechanism by which we can educate the rest of the Faculty. I've taken the 'at-large' part of my representation very seriously, and I have been frustrated, because I have not had the time that I felt has been required to present issues to enough people. So I think that this kind of electronic bulletin board would be very useful, and I make a motion that this happen."

Speaker Martin: "Is there a second?"

Professor John E.H. Sherry, Hotel Administration: "Yes, I'll second it."

Speaker Martin: "Is there discussion? All in favor of the motion, say 'aye' . . . Yes, there is a question."

Professor Fine: "I'm sorry, I don't have my legs under me here. For the first time I hear a letter read to me, and while I'm still trying to digest what it was about, I get a reasonable suggestion that turns into a motion, and before I have time to think about it, we're ready to vote on it already. I'm not under that pressure, though. I don't know that this is the issue we need to be dealing with. I have some concerns here that we are confronting issues that may be not of our concern, and this may be one of them. I'll just quit with that."

Dean Stein: "I move to refer this matter to the University Faculty Committee."

Professor Norton: "Second."

Speaker Martin: "There's been a motion to refer this to the University Faculty Committee, and it has been seconded. Is there discussion? All in favor, say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'; it is carried."

Professor Lesser: "It seems to me, and I think the bringing of this letter before the Senate—though it was a reasonable letter—raises the issue further: Basically, we have no clear process, or at least no process that I'm aware of, as to how items get on the agenda. How is it that that letter got on the agenda? It may be perfectly appropriate, but it seems to me that if we're going to have an organizational system here, that's the first thing we need to clarify. Is it, as I understand, an issue to individually write a letter to the Dean of Faculty requesting an item to be on the agenda? Should the University Faculty Committee be required to respond in writing if the Dean does not include something on the agenda or chooses to postpone discussion until a later date? What is the procedure? We've recognized that our time as a body is extremely limited, and we have to make clear decisions as to how to use that time most effectively. I would hope that we could clarify, at least, that issue about our procedures in the near future."

Speaker Martin: "Is there further discussion? If not, the floor is now open for new business."

#### **4. NEW BUSINESS**

Professor Howland: "Thank you. I'm going to move the motion on this blue sheet that's before you. I left off the words 'Be It Resolved:'—so please add them.

In order to maintain and improve the quality of education and research at Cornell, faculty lines that are vacated because of failed tenure decisions should remain in the affected department (or section) and be filled expeditiously using established University procedures for the search and appointment of faculty.

##### **Rationale (not part of the motion)**

1. Faculty lines vacated by failed tenure decisions are particularly important to departments and sections since they are occupied by junior members who forge the future of academic units. Freezing these faculty lines seriously thwarts the normal development of academic units already negatively affected by the negative tenure decision.
2. Junior faculty often have teaching commitments that are larger than those of senior faculty; thus the freezing of junior faculty lines disproportionately affects the quality of education in negative ways.
3. The practice of hiring instructors to continue the teaching of core curriculum courses in the absence of faculty replacement undermines the quality of education on campus. Cornell students can expect to be taught by the faculty, especially in core courses.
4. Freezing faculty lines vacated by failed tenure decisions is a disincentive of the faculty to forward negative tenure decisions.
5. Freezing faculty lines vacated by failed tenure decisions encourages departments and sections to consider issues that should have no impact whatsoever on the review of the academic qualifications and promise of tenure candidates.

"Due to the shortness of time, I will just summarize the points listed below, which I hope you've read."

Speaker Martin: "Is there a second to the motion?" [Seconded]

Professor Howland: "The first one says that when a faculty line is vacated by a failed tenure decision, that means we've lost a junior faculty person. And that person was often heavily involved in teaching. So to find that position frozen leaves a real hole in the development of the department—and also in the educational duties of the department. It hits it very hard. The practice of hiring instructors—which is often the only alternative left—to take care of core curriculum courses really cheats our students and, I think, should be avoided at all costs. Lastly, and quite important to me, is that freezing faculty lines vacated by failed tenure decisions is a 'dis-incentive' of the Faculty to forward negative tenure decisions. It encourages departments and sections that should have no impact whatsoever on the academic qualifications of their candidates.

"As I mentioned before, the practice across the University is quite diverse. In fact, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, which has undergone tremendous shrinkage of faculty, has not engaged in this practice—it has managed to downsize without doing this. I don't know why, but I was talking to someone in Engineering, and I found that their college has lost twenty positions since 1990, and they have frozen everything in sight. I don't know how they got into that box, but somehow they did. I would hope that could be avoided. In my own college, the College of Arts and Sciences, and in particular in the Division of Biological Sciences, three of our Arts positions have been frozen. That has had a terribly destructive effect on our curriculum. I think if that keeps up, it is, indeed, going to introduce into tenure reviews certain considerations outside those of academic qualifications. I firmly believe in what I said last week—that the Faculty should resist this in every way it can. But, on the other hand, there are pressures that one is going to respond to. If your curriculum is falling apart because you don't have the basic faculty, that's really putting people under a lot of pressure not to appoint someone who is clearly unqualified—but it is awfully difficult to be in that position. So that's why I recommend this motion to you."

Speaker Martin: "The floor is open for discussion."

Professor Emeritus Holcomb: "I'd like to oppose this motion strongly. This is an exceedingly blunt instrument, and it deals with an area in which it's not clear to me that it's appropriate for the Faculty Senate to act to instruct, college by college, what the administrators should do with respect to managing their resources."

Professor Reeve Parker, English: "I just want to say that I understand that this would apply only to lines vacated when tenure promotions fail, not upon retirement. Is that correct?"

Professor Howland: "That is right."

Professor Kramnick: "I second what Professor Holcomb said: I think this is an inappropriate motion. I also find shocking what's implied by the second rationale—that junior faculty often teach *more* than senior faculty. Is that, in fact the case?"

Assistant Professor Carlo D. Montemagno, Agricultural and Biological Engineering (At-large): "I would like to support this motion. I think this motion goes to the very heart of the tenure process: If there is any type of persuasion to assuage the integrity of the reviews, the idea of having that line removed if a review is not favorable to the candidate from the department, it becomes strongly possible to reduce the quality of tenured faculty before it gets to the Provost's level. If there is anything that the Administration can do to harm the integrity of the tenure review process, it is to place the pressure that if a selected candidate is not awarded tenure, the department might lose a tenured line."

N. David Mermin, Horace White Professor of Physics: "But guaranteeing that a line will continue is an equally dangerous thing to do, because it can excite all kinds of visions of what could be done other than promoting the candidate. This is an extremely complicated issue. I don't see how we can possibly decide in five minutes whether to support it or not."

Professor Montemagno: "The fact of the matter is that the line should remain with the department, because that's where it belongs."

Professor Scott: "I'd like to point out that not everyone at the University has a teaching position. We have a number of faculty in our department (Entomology) who do extension, and I would argue that this proposal is a little on the dangerous side, because a failed tenure promotion could entail, over time—perhaps eight or nine years—that the department might find a better way to use this. I would also argue that, as Professor Kramnick brought up, if there's a vacancy in teaching the core curriculum, it's up to the senior faculty to pitch in—it's not just the assistant professors who we should demand to teach our core classes."

Speaker Martin: "Does anyone else wish to speak before I return to Professor Howland?"

Professor Howland: "With all due respect, Professor Holcomb, I don't think this is a blunt instrument; it is, instead, a very sharp instrument. It singles out a practice which I think is incorrect, and it makes a recommendation of the Faculty not to do that. We obviously are not the Administration, but we've all agreed that the role of the Faculty is to advise the Administration. With regard to teaching—in fact, in the sciences, one does come in with a heavy teaching load. As one becomes more senior, one's research

develops&endash;certainly in biological sciences&endash;and one fills one's laboratory with post-docs. Generally speaking, the amount of actual teaching of the curriculum at the undergraduate level does often decrease."

Professor Kramnick: "That's shocking."

Speaker Martin: "Before Professor Norton calls for Orders of the Day, the Speaker will ask for a vote to be taken. All in favor of the proposal, say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'; the proposal is defeated. We are adjourned; have a good summer."

Adjourned: 6:05 PM

Respectfully submitted,

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