

### **Clinical Tenure Chat at the 5/13 Senate**

- 15:59:34 From K.E. von Wittelsbach : I support Risa's view on this.
- 16:02:48 From Wendy Wilcox : How many clinical faculty will this impact?
- 16:03:28 From Tracy Stokol : This graph lacks the 6 schools that are in the top tier of the clinical program that do not have tenure at all for clinical faculty
- 16:03:59 From Estelle McKee : This proposal would affect 9 clinical profs at the Law School
- 16:04:09 From Wendy Wilcox : thanks
- 16:04:45 From Harold Hodes : On this proposal, who would vote in tenure decisions, both for doctrinal and clinical tenure cases? I wonder whether tenured faculty in one track would have the optimal background for assessing candidates on the other track.
- 16:05:23 From Estelle McKee : @Tracy Stokol: Yes, there are some top schools that are only on contract. But we want to do more at the Law School, raise our clinical ranking; also recognize the work clinical faculty do.
- 16:05:28 From Tracy Stokol : I think everyone should have a chance to raise their question and the voting should be delayed
- 16:07:07 From Joanie Mackowski : @Estelle McKee: the schools you're speaking of that are only on contract: are there also tenure-track faculty in those programs?
- 16:07:29 From Estelle McKee : @Harold Hodes: clinical tenured profs would NOT vote on doctrinal tenure.
- 16:07:31 From Ken Birman : With existing tenure, a faculty member who is considered for tenure but denied must then leave Cornell. Moreover, if hired on a tenured line, tenure must be decided after six years (with extensions for some special situations). Will this policy also apply to Clinical faculty who come up for tenure?
- 16:08:50 From Joanie Mackowski : @Estelle McKee: the schools you're speaking of that are only on contract: are there also tenure-track \*doctrinal\* faculty in those programs?
- 16:09:00 From Estelle McKee : @Ken Birman: yes.
- 16:09:20 From Estelle McKee : @Joanie: Yes.
- 16:09:58 From Thomas Björkman : Tracy Stokol's point is correct. This will immediately raise the same issues for comparable roles and limitations of senior RTE faculty in other colleges.
- 16:10:54 From Estelle McKee : Well... not necessarily. Are those RTE faculty central to the schools' missions? Clinical Profs at the Law School are.
- 16:10:59 From Tracy Stokol : Doctrinal tenured faculty will vote on clinical tenure faculty but not vice versa

16:11:11 From Shannon Gleeson : I did not hear that clinical scholarship is of lesser quality. Please explain the markers of research excellence for clinical faculty, which as I understand involves law review publication, but other types of legal writing.

16:12:30 From Wendy Wilcox : It sounds like the issue is rigid standards for tenure versus allowing for a range of meaningful contributions to the field

16:12:33 From Jamila Michener : I agree with Richard. Unitary tenure is preferred. Inequities are not preferred. Outside of a real path forward towards unitary tenure, which no one seems to be proposing in sufficient detail, using unitary tenure as a foil strikes me as a hollow argument.

16:12:34 From Tracy Stokol : @Estelle. Yes, they are central to the college's mission

16:12:43 From Estelle McKee : @Shannon: I believe it also addresses more practice-oriented scholarship, as opposed to theory. So submissions to international tribunals might count. Perhaps legal briefs that raise new arguments and forward the thinking in particular areas might count.

16:13:22 From Malte Ziewitz : @Jamila: Agreed.

16:13:23 From Tracy Stokol : The standards for clinical tenure have not been defined

16:13:57 From Tracy Stokol : FYI: I did not state that it will be of lower quality. In my view it is different activity and it should be tenurable under the current system not a separate system

16:14:10 From Estelle McKee : @Tracy: if they are central to the college's mission, and really contribute to the area, then why not? If you practice in an area in which the unitary tenure standards can be expanded relatively quickly —I imagine that's the case in the sciences—then OK. I think that is what Ken Birman described as happening in his field in one of the recent meetings. But that isn't going to happen in law.

16:14:47 From Thomas Björkman : @Estelle, Yes, many senior RTE faculty have roles that are essential to our mission, of a long-term nature, for which we want to recruit top people; but the roles are different from those of TT faculty.

16:14:52 From Estelle McKee : The standards of clinical tenure aren't what's before the Senate right now. Right now, we're talking about getting a waiver to pursue this in the future.

16:15:00 From Tracy Stokol : @Estelle. I think this is a financial issue committing long-term to faculty

16:15:41 From Estelle McKee : @Tracy: And the standards for clinical tenure are in fact described in the Law School's proposal

16:16:08 From Joanie Mackowski : @Tracy: a financial issue? It's an issue of trying to retain excellent faculty in the law school. Yes, there's a financial dimension to that.

16:17:03 From Ken Birman : @Estelle McKee, at this point I no longer believe that a single (unitary) policy can cover the law school case. I did feel that way previously, but I am now in favor of the law school proposal.

16:17:36        From Aziz Rana : Shannon, that's right. The tenure expectations would include assessments of scholarship, teaching, service, and one's professional role. it would also include a strong expectation of producing scholarship of high quality, certainly not lesser than doctrinal. But there would be different expectations, such as for quantity of scholarship, given the very distinct time allocations of clinical vs. doctrinal faculty.