

A MEETING
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2018

1. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Sam Nelson: “All right, I'm going to call the meeting to order. My name is Sam Nelson. I am the speaker of the faculty senate, and I'd like to start by asking someone to make a motion that we approve the minutes from last week's meeting. I have a motion. Do I have a second? Yes. All in favor, say "aye. (Ayes.)”

“All opposed? Okay, those minutes are approved. I want to remind the body that senators have priority in speaking, that only senators or their designated alternates may vote. Also, I ask them to please identify yourself when you speak, before you say your piece, what your name is and what department you teach in or are associated with.

“And I also would like to suggest that the maximum speaking time be about two minutes. Of course, we can always give you extra time; but that way, everybody can have a chance and we can probably finish on time. Our normal parliamentarian, Michael Gold, is not here today, so I will have the honor of holding the iPad with the clock on it.

“At that point, I would like to call up Charles Van Loan, the dean of the faculty, to make announcements.”

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS – DEAN CHARLES VAN LOAN

Dean Van Loan: “Not too many announcements. A big transition in our office. Karen Lucas, who's worked there for ten years, probably knows more about the university than any other single person, and I'm not kidding, is retiring. She is up there. Let us give her a round of applause.

(APPLAUSE)

“We did a little calculation, and she's attended over 80 senate meetings, so I'm not -- and survived. Replacing Karen is Jill Short. Jill, just come on out.

(APPLAUSE)

“Jill has worked in the vet dean's office for quite -- about 16 years and has been at Cornell for 33 years. And the transition will take place in January, so welcome aboard.

(APPLAUSE)

“The only real announcement, the registrar affects our lives probably almost more than deans, in a way, and Cassie Dembosky is retiring. So the search is on

for replacement; and there's also just one notch above a slight rearrangement. There is going to be a new vice provost position for enrollment.

"Now, the registrar deals internally in ways we all know, but there's also an external component, dealing with the reporting, regulations, certifications, and so on, so that's going to be the new structure. There will be activity in January, when this all starts up, and I'll make sure there's a way for us to express our views on that.

"Those are the only two announcements. Is there any general question you have for me? Okay, thanks."

[Speaker Nelson](#): "Great. I'd like to call up [Chris Schaffer](#), the associate dean of faculty, to talk about sense of the senate resolutions."

3. SENSE OF SENATE RESOLUTION - [RESOLUTION](#), [SLIDES](#) - [CHRIS SCHAFFER](#), ASSOCIATE DEAN OF FACULTY.

[Associate Dean Chris Schaffer](#): "Good afternoon, everybody. This week, [Charlie](#), myself and [University Faculty Committee](#) pulled together five sense of the senate resolutions from last month's meeting. The first three deal broadly with the topic of the process around revising the policies for evaluating accusations of sexual misconduct, where faculty or staff are involved. As you may recall, there was an idea that was brought to the senate, and a lot of concerns were raised.

"I would say one of the key take-aways from our last meeting was a sense of -- an appreciative sense of the response to those concerns, which has been to stop, to form a new committee, which I'm on, to try to evaluate these procedures and bring a new proposal to the senate. So we felt it would be valuable for the senate to acknowledge good behavior when we see it, and that's the point of this resolution.

"Any comments or discussion?"

[Senator Bruce Lewenstein](#): "[Bruce Lewenstein](#) from STS. I am not sure what the appropriate level of comment is on sense of the senate resolutions, since we are new on this. I have had raised to me a concern about where student input will come, given that the people -- although the policy is about faculty misconduct, students are often involved, and there was a question of whether students would be involved in helping establish the policy."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "Thank you so much for that comment. In fact, at the initial meeting of this committee, that was recognized as a problem, and a member of the GPSA is being identified to come and talk with us, as it was felt that it was the graduate students who were probably the folks who would be most relevant for that discussion."

[Senator Ken Birman](#), Computer Science: "I have a purely procedural question. Does the sense of the senate resolution involve a vote? And if it does, do we have a quorum? It looks like we're very poorly attended today."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "So it does involve a vote, but it does not require a quorum, as this is not a formal resolution."

"Any other questions? Okay, so I will call for a vote, then. All in favor of this resolution, please say "aye."

"(Ayes.) Any opposed? Okay, this carries."

"The second resolution was more substantive. It seemed there was a broad consensus in the room that two key features that were not in the original proposed policy need to be a part of any adjudication procedure for acquisitions of sexual misconduct against faculty or staff. That was a clean separation of the investigation and adjudication phases of the process, and having an evidentiary - a live evidentiary hearing before a panel, that would then make a recommendation around whether or not the accused is responsible."

"Questions or discussion on this? In that case, all in favor, please say "aye." (Ayes.)"

"Any opposed? This carries. This is one where I think an example of this will matter, so I will bring this back to this committee that is looking to revise these procedures. And this is now a sense of the senate representing the faculty that these two are essential elements of the process, so this is how I hope this, over time, will come to work."

"The third resolution is sort of a broader procedural one. There were a lot of comments about why were we just hearing about this now, why didn't we know about the efforts to revise a process that's so fundamental to faculty; and this is just putting into writing another request that policy decisions that substantively affect faculty be developed in consultation with faculty representatives, beginning at an early stage in the process."

"Any comments? Okay, all in favor? (Ayes). Any opposed? Okay, this passes."

"The fourth resolution came out of [President Pollack's](#) conversation with the senate. One of the issues that came up at the last faculty meeting was regarding institutional-level collaborations with institutions in Saudi Arabia, especially in light of some recent events there."

"So this resolution essentially asks that [President Pollack](#) articulate the conditions under which she would imagine the university would decline to enter or would withdraw from an institutional-level collaboration or cooperation agreement with another university or institution, due to concerns about human rights, academic freedom or student safety."

"I think [President Pollack](#) had some good ideas that were sort of casually mentioned, both at that meeting and in a couple of other locations. This is asking that those be written down, brought back to the senate for us to debate.

"Questions or comments? Yes, Ken."

[Senator Birman](#): "I am going to urge that we vote this down, and I just want to quickly explain several reasons for that. First of all, let me just say I am as appalled by the behavior of the king of Saudi Arabia as anyone, and I understand the sentiment that drives this, but I'm quite concerned about an attempt to politicize the senate and to use the senate to force a politicization of university policy. And first of all, because it demands that the president take an action troubles me somewhat.

"Secondly, it talks about academic freedom, but I'll just remind people that in our last discussion of a thing like this, which related at the time to New York City Tech and Technion, there was a large group of people who actually didn't want to teach students, unless they renounced their Israeli affiliations. At that time, it was part of the BDS boycott that they were basically endorsing.

"And I think that it points to the slope we can slide down, where we take a somewhat -- and obviously good position. We shouldn't support this king -- and we turn it into something that harms students who are just trying to come here and study. And so it's a perversion of academic freedom, carried to that point, and I think that this starts us down that process. I just want to urge that we not start down that process. I think the sentiment here is very understandable, and I actually kind of support it, but I don't think this is the right way to carry out that sentiment."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "Thank you. Comment here."

[Senator Richard Miller](#), Philosophy. "I disagree with [Professor Birman's](#) position and also his characterization of responses to the Technion's participation in Cornell Tech. I think he's simply wrong on the facts. I do think we shouldn't -- although I support this resolution, I think we shouldn't depend on President Pollack's response for our further discussion.

"I do think that what Cornell does when it institutionally affiliates with, for example, the kingdom of Saudi Arabia, is a political act and one to which we respond. The kingdom of Saudi Arabia's atrocities in Yemen, causing the deaths of many thousands of innocent civilians, are with the material support of the U.S. Government. Seems to me that a major American institution disengaging or participating in activities with the kingdom of Saudi Arabia then becomes an important political choice that we should be part of.

"I do think that given [President Pollack's](#) response to the letter on this matter, signed by, I don't know, I guess two dozen Cornell faculty and graduate students

and staff, that appeared in "The Sun," President Pollack will respond, if at all, with vague generalities that don't mean much.

"I believe that's perfectly appropriate in the general case. There is not much one can say on the general case. I think that is a basis for our discussing particular cases and exchanging views and enhancing understanding from the many different perspectives of different departments at Cornell.

"For example, I think we should strongly disaffiliate with the kingdom of Saudi Arabia in our institutional actions. I don't think any such disaffiliation with Chinese academic institutions is a good idea. That is because of the nature of the repressive activities in question, the extent of U.S. participation, and the value of the different kinds of exchanges. That is something to discuss concretely.

"I would hope it's the intention of the senate leadership that we discuss these issues in the spring, quite apart from any response by President Pollack. That could be in the resolution itself; but fine, if that's the senate leadership's intention."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "Thank you."

[Senator Sherry Colb](#), Law School: "I would just say that the moment we start divesting from one country, then every country from which we do not divest will infer that we approve of everything we're doing, so I don't think that we can just take one thing at a time, because I think that makes a statement that has implications for other things too. I think that we should vote against this resolution.

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "Thank you."

[Senator Estelle McKee](#), Law School. "So I don't entirely disagree. My question is more, this sense of the senate resolution is really about transparency; is it not? Just to have the president put in writing what the conditions are, under which the university would decline or withdraw from agreements, which I am curious about. I don't know what those conditions are."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "Correct. The intent of this resolution was to ask the president to articulate in writing that perspective, not asking the president to take any action, either generally or with regard to any specific institutions or countries, and the hope is that this would then become the starting point for exactly the kinds of both general and specific conversations around the appropriateness of Cornell engaging at an institutional level with institutions and other places. That was the intent, and I apologize if the wording clouds that intent.

"Just one second. Is there anyone else who would like to speak on this sense of the senate resolution? Okay, please. And then Ken, we'll give you final word."

[Senator Joanie Mackowski](#), English Department: "I don't want to say I support this resolution. I think it is the opposite of a, say, would bring in kind of a

slippery slope argument. And it's the general, it's the abstract. We are not speaking about specific countries.

"And perhaps [President Pollack's](#) response would be that no, no actions would ever lead me to withdraw from interactions with another university, but that we often want to consider how to respond to atrocity, so that would be a very good, concrete way to begin the discussion."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "[Ken](#)."

[Professor Birman](#): "I just thought I would comment on [Dick's](#) response, which touched on my point about Israel; but then China, we also have Russia and Hungary, which are examples of countries that kill their dissidents. It does strike me there's a broad principle here and that this is ill-thought-out and a bit abrupt. I wouldn't object to a more considered dialogue about this in the senate, but I think this is a very quick move to demand something of the president prematurely, before we even understand what we're doing."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "Thank you. Any more discussion?"

"Okay, so with our newly formed quorum, my guess is this is going to be more mixed, so why don't we do show of hands.

"Charlie, could you help count?"

"So all in favor, please raise your hands and hold them up.

"What did you count? Where did you count? Everywhere?"

"Okay, thank you. I caught 27, so we'll go for 26 and a half.

"Everyone opposed?"

"16. So motion carries. We will, for the sense of senate resolutions, we will note what carried unanimously and what carried with mixed votes.

"The final resolution had to do with the brief presentation we had about ongoing efforts to revise the processes for adjudicating accusations of misconduct, where fraternities, sororities are the responding organization. There were sort of two points that were primarily brought up by the faculty.

"One was increased transparency about the nature of accusations that are made and how -- and what the outcomes of investigations into them are made. And in fact, there is a score card that we believe will go live soon, which will detail the history of accusations and findings against fraternities and sororities, so it seemed the senate in general supported that effort.

"There are also questions about efforts to educate individuals who were interested in participating in fraternities and sororities, or members who were already in fraternities and sororities, about both their rights as members who are trying to join these organizations and about their responsibilities and how they interact and treat with others, including new potential members, when they are part of these organizations.

"In fact, the Office of Student and Campus Life, under [Ryan Lombardi](#), has developed a set of new training materials that were, I believe, first deployed last year and will be required for all members who want to join fraternities or sororities. And so again, I think the sense of the senate is we support those activities.

"Any comments or discussion on this resolution, which would be communicated to [Ryan](#)?"

[Senator Rhonda Gilmore](#), Design and Environmental Analysis: "My question is where will the score card -- or how will the score card be available? Will it be available for parents? Will it be available for a variety of potential users of that information?"

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "Thank you. The intention is for the score card to be publicly available on our website."

[Senator Michael Mazourek](#), at-large: "A concern that is maybe just because I don't understand some of it, but the score card outlining the accusations, to me, that seems to kind of short-circuit legal process, so I wonder if a better term might be "that outlines findings of misconduct and accusations." I don't understand why it's accusations."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "Thank you for the comment. The current plan for the score card is to outline accusations and, for each accusation, to state whether it was dropped for lack of evidence, it was pursued and there was some resolution; but information both on accusations, as well as findings, would be made publicly available."

[Senator Mazourek](#): "It just seems like just the accusations, I think just listing those, I think that might be an unfair and unfounded way to characterize someone -- it leads to things that are just not consistent with the legal process, just to list those, perhaps."

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "And if the respondent was an individual, I would be in 100% agreement. I think from my own perspective, where I set now, this is worth a try and needs to be monitored. And if it seems like spurious accusations are being leveled for the purpose of influencing what's on the dashboard, then things would need to be readdressed.

"Okay, all in favor? I am sorry. All in favor, please say "aye." (Ayes.). Any opposed?"

"Great, and this one passes as well. Thank you so much, and -- sorry. Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't hear. I'll catch it right now."

[Senator Mackowski](#): "Thank you. Joanie Mackowski, in English. There was the presentation from the library board. Why do we not have a sense of the senate in regard to that?"

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): “Yeah, thank you very much. Looking through my, [Charlie](#) and members of the University Faculty Committee, there wasn't any sort of something that felt like there would be firm consensus that we were able to identify. Our strategy with the sense of senate resolutions is these were -- the drafts that we put together were posted last week and are available for comment, including “you missed this and this should be included.”

“So anyone who is a member of the senate is welcome to propose to us a sense of the senate statement that they feel either you want to just proffer it immediately, or if you feel there's something that we missed in the draft that we circulated with the agenda last week.

“Thank you. And I understand there were a couple of nays that I didn't quite catch on the last sense of the senate resolution. Would those who voted no please quickly raise their hands. We can get the number.

“Five. Thank you.”

[Speaker Nelson](#): “Okay, I'd like to call [Charlie Van Loan](#), Dean of Faculty, to come up and talk about concerns that relate to the RTE faculty representation resolution.”

4. CONCERNS THAT RELATE TO THE [RTE FACULTY REPRESENTATION -- RESOLUTION - SLIDES - CHARLIES VAN LOAN, DEAN OF FACULTY](#)

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Thank you very much. Let me explain where we are, and let me begin, the goal today is to hear all possible concerns. I spent the last two months seeking out people who have concerns. I just want to make sure these are all known to all of us, so we have a very educated vote in February.

“Here is where we are. Depending on what transpires here, we have a resolution. Maybe we want to modify this or that part of it, so I'm happy to work with anyone over the break on that. If you have a concern and feel you'd like something to show up in a vote, when we start looking at this in February, great. I'm very happy to help you with that.

“Don't forget that the vote, which probably will be in February, is not the end. Because we're changing senate bylaws, we have to have a referendum after that, going to all the university faculty, which there are about 1,600.

“Just the review of terminology. Tenure track, assistant, associate, full professors are defined the university faculty. The RTE faculty consists of all those other titles, which you see listed there. An important definition here is what we call university voting rights, as opposed to college voting rights or department voting rights.

“It is quite simple. If you have university voting rights, that means you can sit here as a regular senator and you can participate in the kind of university-level elections that show up once a year: For my position, Chris's position, faculty

trustee; and then we have two committees, the N&E Committee and the UFC. Those are also elected positions, so with university voting rights, you can do all those things.

"Here is the resolution at a glance. We are going to identify a subset of the university faculty that have university voting rights. Departments and schools can send either a university faculty member or such an RTE faculty member to the senate; above and beyond that, the creation of approximately 20 RTE-only seats that are apportioned among the colleges according to how many RTE faculty they have. These are at-large, within the colleges. There is a recipe, depending on how many you get, and it adds up to about 20.

"The library will have a full voting seat. Postdocs will have, like the undergrads, like the grads, like the employees, an ex officio seat. Think of all those as channels.

"Any question about what the resolution is about? All these things involve changing the bylaws. And online, you can actually see before and after passages from the bylaws that, if enacted, would realize these things.

"What the senate would look like. In red are the changes. Again, your department can send a senior lecturer to the senate. There will be 20 more people here -- well, there will be a slightly larger group; the library, the postdocs and so on, so that's what the senate would look like.

"Let us start talking about concerns, and here's kind of an overarching one. Again, I want to be absolutely clear; I'm trying to present the full, big picture as I have deduced it from talking to lots of people in the last couple of months, so one question here is, is the university faculty giving up control of the senate. And the answer is no, in the following sense: There are lines in the bylaws -- and these are not university bylaws -- the senate bylaws, which go by the name of organization and procedures of the university faculty.

"There are lines in there, these lines that will not change, so these have never been enacted. Whatever we do in the senate can be nullified by the university faculty. There are ways for me to call a meeting of the university faculty, where these things can be done. We can meet on our own, so that part does not change.

"Three additional perspectives that we all know are true. Well, we just had a pretty close vote, but rarely is it a 50-49 setting. I just mention that. And most of our stuff, advisory. You might say well, there's some issues that are peculiar to the tenure track faculty and where are we going to talk about them.

"Well, the fact is, there's a way of doing that, through committees and whatever. As I mentioned there in Point 3, they can be roll call votes, where you can deduce how the different faculties think, if it comes down to that; but take something like the role of teaching in promotion, and maybe we want to change what the assistant to associate professor's seen in that regard.

"Well, all that discussion about teaching there would pretty much apply also to lecturer to senior lecturer promotion, so I want to stress just how much in common the issues are, quote, confronting the two faculties. So a couple perspectives about what we might do in the senate.

"Now, I want to step through these slow, pausing after each one, and get your thoughts on these. So I break them down into four categories: Voice, identity, voting and ratio. Voice, again, will the expanded senate, with RTE members in it, have a diminished voice? That is to say, the provost and president, they are going to be less likely to listen to us, or whoever does listen to us, are they going to have a lower -- is the impact going to be reduced.

"Identity. So words and acronyms are incredibly important. RTE faculty is our choice, the committee's choice. The question is, is that the best way to refer to everybody, all the academics not on the tenure track.

"Voting. There are about 22,000 RTE faculty. Half of them will get voting rights. Those that don't are in the visitor, short-term category; but nevertheless, a line was drawn. Was that line drawn in the right place?

"Ratio. Do we need legislation to prevent an RTE majority in the senate? Let us go through these slow-like, and see what you think.

"The voice concern, the question then is will the senate have a reduced voice. The reasoning the committee followed was basically this: Voice depends on the quality of the message, more than on titles. You'll be listened to much more likely, if you have a reasoned, logical and perceptive thing to say.

"Now, of course, there are going to be listeners out there who weight the words of an endowed chair, full professor more than, say, a lecturer; but in the end, we make group decisions and it's the intelligence behind those advisory things we do that counts. And if we have everyone in the room, so to speak, that is more likely to happen.

"Senior lecturers see teaching in a different way than lots of us, and they can contribute to things. If the issue is external funding and what it does for the operations here on campus, researchers, of which there are 400 on campus, have an awful lot to say.

"Alternative to this is the idea why don't we just create a second senate, an RTE senate. That means we don't rock the faculty senate boat. It stays the same; same group, same everything, no change, but now we have a separate senate for RTE faculty, a venue where they can raise issues and make judgments and so on.

"That, of course, is not for free. There is an office of assemblies that would have to now coordinate this fifth assembly. There would be two senates out there. If you believe there are an awful lot of common issues, there will be an awful lot of communication and coordination that would be required. Nevertheless, the argument goes this is a proper solution. I should mention, in the very quick

survey we did one year ago -- we got about 80 responses -- quite a few mentioned the second senate idea.

"So let me pause here, and if people would like to speak to either side here about this."

[Senator Birman](#), Computer Science: "We have several teaching faculty who would be part of this RTE group. They asked me to oppose this suggestion that there should be a separate RTE senate, and they argued that a great many of their issues are common with the tenured faculty and, as [Charlie](#) mentioned earlier, votes could be tabulated separately if we did run into a situation where there was some kind of a necessity of tabulating separately, and that a single senate speaking for all the teaching faculty at Cornell would actually have a stronger voice for the administration."

[Senator Anthony Hay](#), Microbiology: "CALs recently reorganized its senate into an executive committee because of poor attendance. And just when you are dealing with a smaller body, you have fewer representatives. The logistics of running a senate for a small group are such that it often ends up being less effective, and so I think just from a logistics standpoint, you also need to consider that it would be very hard for these individuals who don't have service in their bailiwick to then contribute to running a full-sail senate, so I agree with Ken."

[Senator Richard Bense](#), Government: "I have one concern, which is if we expand by 20, I think it will be more difficult to get a quorum for this group, and that is a concern. That leads to a question, which is are the RTE faculty actually expressing interest in this change? Is there enough sentiment, indications of interest that they actually will attend, once this goes through?"

"And then very generally, [Charlie](#) I really respect all the hard work and the care and the consultation. I would like to know how you feel about all this."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "Well, a couple things. Whatever we emerge with here and whatever is likely to come up here in February, we're going to do a Qualtrics poll of all the NTT faculty to get a reading on that, maybe before our senate vote. All the anecdotal evidence suggests a lot of interest among the RTE faculty in this; but again, it's a myth -- well, both faculties are extremely busy.

"When I look at the quorum, all I know, we are extremely busy and it has to be worth coming, to a certain extent, and to make this interesting topics and so on. It is a risk. In other words, you said harder to reach quorum. We just have to take a chance with that; but again, I kind of feel that with the two faculties involved, we'd have more energetic conversations here.

"I was on the committee and I'm in favor of all those things, but I really want to make sure this is -- we put the best thing in front of the senate in February. It is not going to be very nice if it is a 50-49 vote. It has to be real consensus; so I am out here, looking for the weak points in the proposal.

“And there's some good discussions that you'll see in some of the follow-up slides here, so I just want to get a good, healthy consensus, because it's not going to be pretty if we just barely pass something here and then the referendum does not. Is that okay of -- okay.

“I should mention at NYU, they have a senate and you could have caucuses. It would be a group of faculty here, RTE faculty who can get together and, if things all pass, there's a lot of follow-up work about committees. Will we have a committee dedicated to RTE issues? There is a lot of follow-up stuff in that regard.

“If you look at the different universities, they have -- we have a huge senate. Like our board of trustees is huge, at 64, yet every place has some version of a senate, some version of the UFC and some version of the UA, in different mixes and so on, so it's very hard to compare things. This, however, we definitely would be making a statement in the space of higher education, I would say.

“The identity concern, RTE faculty. First of all, there hasn't been much pushback on use of the word "faculty." You go back to the early 2000s, when we were doing the specialty professorships, there was argument about using the word "professor" in a title. So maybe the analog now, 15 to 18 years later would be hey, I'm a little anxious about you calling an extension associate a faculty member, but the definition of faculty that we're taking is someone whose job description is some mix of teaching and research on or off-campus.

“Furthermore, if you look in the university bylaws and the language in Article 14, where they talk about college faculty, the faculties, this squares with that. So there's nothing controversial about faculty, but maybe you have some thoughts on that.

“Then you get down to the acronym, RTE. Does that cover everything? Again, we feel it does. However, what's the alternative view here? If you don't like the word "faculty," you can use other terminology. First of all, non-tenure track faculty is really a poor choice of words. To define something in the negative is just not appropriate, so that's kind of out the window.

“But then you have things like faculty affiliates, faculty associates. Again, those kind of terms, they don't tell you what the people do, so it's flawed in that way. And plus, it has an overtone of a second tier of faculty. We shouldn't be in the business of this and that. It's like faculty, period, and everyone has a different job description.

“Then there was some pushback, mostly from the Vet School. The Vet School and Law School have clinical professors, and the Vet School has a huge mix of titles and is very thoughtful, I would say, about how we reason about titles. They spent a lot of time on this.

"And there's some feeling there should be a C in there for clinical. But then you talk about slippery slope; I have the entrepreneurial side to my job and why don't we have a second E in there. Or the library, how about the L? Again, I don't think it's worth going there. You could argue these points over and over again.

"I did look up the definition of clinical faculty in the bylaws, and it basically says teaching in a clinical setting. The committee's okay with RTE. It is short, it's descriptive; but anyway, that's the identity concern. Would anyone like to comment on the choice of the term here, RTE faculty?"

[Senator Gilmore](#): "Rhonda Gilmore, Design and Environmental Analysis. The College of Human Ecology made a decision a few years ago that every time an email is sent to a faculty member in our college, it is noted as tenured faculty. And every time I get an email, I am noted as non-tenured faculty, and so I find it exceedingly demeaning. I have taught here for 25 years, and so I believe that the RTE is a very effective way to end discrimination, because I find it very, very offensive."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "A good point about things of the college, and maybe there are stories like that at the department level. We are not going to tell the colleges and the departments how -- who comes to your meetings. It might have something to do with the size of your conference table, for all we know. We are not going to get involved in that.

"However, what we're doing at the university level is setting a tone. We are setting an example, saying this is how, at this level, we refer to our colleagues, and the hope here would be that all the colleges and all the departments, if they diverge from that way of thinking, they maybe pause and think again about how they address that set of colleagues."

[Senator Maureen Hanson](#), Molecular Biology and Genetics: "This was actually something that was a concern to some people in my department, using the word "faculty" for this group. Not RTE, but the word "faculty." One of the reasons for this is that, at least in the biological sciences, a research associate is often a postdoc who's exhausted their first three years of research, and they are then promoted to research associate.

"Nowadays, in the biological sciences, you often have to postdoc for five years before you get your next job, so there was a concern referring to these individuals who were largely performing research and not doing all these other positions as faculty.

"There were two discussions that came out from my department that I'll mention. One is to come up with some other word than "faculty." These are academic title-holders. I don't know what a good word would be, but that was one suggestion, to come up with some other word than "faculty."

"And the second one that some people suggested is that the faculty title would have to be an individual who either had been here a certain length of time or had the word "senior" in front of their name, like a senior research associate, who is, in fact, vetted by the whole department and not just appointed by a faculty member. I don't know what the best solution is, but I wanted to represent the department's concerns about using the word "faculty."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "Yeah, so part of your question comes up in the third thing, about where we draw the line. You mentioned things about how long you've been here, you're pointing to bottom rungs on some of these ladders. That is concern 3. But again, the challenge is come up with something better.

"Again, the simple definition, which squares with Wikipedia, because I did look it up, is if you do some combination of teaching and research. Now, the university faculty have to do both. All these other titles are in one of those dimensions. Of course, all these titles come in many flavors, the ratios vary; but by and large, they're either aligned with teaching, research or extension. Again, if someone can think of a better terminology -- but what is your feeling, if you think about faculty associates or academic associates, do you think that's preferable?"

[Senator Hanson](#): "I think academic associates is a reasonable suggestion, but I think it has to be considered carefully. But I think some other name like that might be appropriate for someone who is -- has a very one-dimensional job. Many of these people that you're referring to, like a research associate, their job really is one-dimensional. I don't know as much about extension associates, but I think in many cases, their job is one-dimensional."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "So you say a faculty has to be -- do both teaching and research. That is your definition of faculty? But like professor of the practice, that's a teaching position. That is not a faculty member; it's one-dimensional.

"Got you. (LAUGHTER)"

[Senator Hanson](#): "I agree completely; it's a very thorny issue and it's very difficult to make these definitions and come up with terminology. I don't have a solution right now."

[Senator Tim DeVoogd](#), Psychology: "I heard from some friends in the Vet School, who felt, as you said, that clinical covers something a little bit different from the flavor of the other two letters, and so we're very strongly in favor of adding C to the group, which allows you, then, to do either certificate or track."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "I kidded that if clinical was spelled with a K, then we would to it T-R-E-K. But if you look in the definition, the job description of clinical professor, line 2 says teaching in the clinical setting. My challenge would be, when that was formed back in the 2000s, why wasn't there a fuss made about that."

[Senator Bruce Lewenstein](#), STS: "I am not quite sure this is the right place to raise this concern, but it's something that's been expressed to me, which is that if the RTE faculty or -- I kind of like academic associates -- become voting members of this body, I'm actually speaking partly in my role as faculty trustee, although they are not eligible to become faculty trustees, in their current voting rights within the employee assembly, they technically are eligible to become employee assemblies. So there is a way in which this removes an opportunity for that faculty, and that question was raised to me."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "So we tried to make this totally additive, that nothing is taken away, but there is -- [Bruce](#) brought up this one issue. Right now, if you are a professor of the practice, you could be the employee trustee.

"It is never going to happen, so it's kind of a false opportunity. In terms of voting, would you rather vote for an employee trustee, which has nothing to do with academics, or look at an array of faculty trustees running for office or from my office, hey, they all say these different sort of things. Who seems to get it? Which would you rather do? I think they would rather have an opportunity, even though they can't be a faculty trustee, to be able to talk or vote for someone who they think captures what it means to be a faculty member here and to tell the trustees.

"Okay, thank you. Let's do the next one. This came up in the question a few minutes ago, which is about where you draw the line. It is not about who's more important or who is more valued. It is not about that. It is about length of appointment. It is about whether you are on a track that has a ladder, where you can be promoted to a more senior level position. That is kind of the dividing line. So if you are a visiting assistant professor or a visiting lecturer, no.

"In this space, one of the trickier ones is adjunct. Adjunct is a modifier. Adjunct, visiting, acting, these are title modifiers. Adjunct only applies to the tenure track, so you could have it be an adjunct associate professor, for example. If you look at the job description of all these different modifiers and the titles, there is kind of a pattern.

"There is a little bit of fuzziness. The adjunct one was a little more difficult; but actually, it's in the university bylaws that adjuncts do not have voting rights, and we are not changing that. It can be revisited, but we're not changing that. For the other appointments, there's nothing said in the university bylaws -- that's our call about how we define voting rights -- about the RTE faculty.

"Here is a concern about where we draw the line. It is a little more specific. It is about the three main tracks: Research associate, lecturer and extension associate. These are each two-level tracks, and arguments can be made that you should split it through the middle.

"In other words, senior lecturers could come to the senate, but lecturers could not. Here is the reason: In general, there's more vetting going on for the senior appointment, and that's important. So you might just want to draw that line. "But if you look at Option B, here's another way you could sort of realize it, and it's a timeline thing that came up in your query, which you could say something like we give you these voting rights, but you can't come here unless you've been around five years. That is to make sure you went through at least one renewal. There has been some vetting, you have been around, you have some experience. And that five years, sort of pulled out of the hat, sort of does the trick in that regard.

"Again, in this where do you draw the line thing, most of it has been -- this has been the discussion. Not so many quibbles about visiting and adjuncts and all that. It is mostly this. For this concern, it's about do we or do we not split those three tracks. If you split them, the 1,000 goes down to about 450. So out there, in these three tracks, at the bottom rung, there are over 500 individuals.

"Going back to the committee reason, we felt you don't need to legislate this. Would a department with 30 people and two lecturers, would they likely send two lecturers to the senate? We feel that departments should, and most of them do, send people who have experience, who are good communicators and so on, who have been around.

"Plus, how many people who are lecturers or just starting out, they aren't going to want this job. And maybe their job description actually forbids it. I am coming in on soft money, I'm 100% in that lab. So we felt in the committee that there's no need to legislate this, that it would work out on its own.

"Anyway, thoughts on this?"

[Senator Mackowski](#): "Regarding things working out on their own, I, too, like to be optimistic, but I'm just recalling how many times over the course of this presentation that you have referred back to well, in 2000, this is how they defined this. And we change.

"And it is nice to have these markers of what our expectations are; not to be doom and gloom about what any faculty meeting is going to look like in 20 years, but to say that yeah, it's good. Someone has been around for five years, I think is the no, and we do need to say individuals should have been around for five years."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "So you like B up there. You like the idea of sort of a quiet bully pulpit to the department saying when you pick your senator, free range, but don't send someone who's been here less than five years. You like that kind of language?"

[Senator Mackowski](#): "Yes, a mark that indicates a long-term investment in the university and being vetted."

[Senator Hanson](#): "I am a little confused about what you're talking about now. There is the voting rights of the RTE faculty, as we'll call them for now, on such things as your position and faculty trustees; and then there's also whether or not they can serve as the senator. So which are we talking about?"

[Dean Van Loan](#): "Good point. The question here, we focused on the last five minutes on who can come to the senate, and the five-year thing speaks to that. One could say that's the definition of having university voting rights. In addition to what we have down there already, at least five years.

"You could add that in there, so I guess maybe that's the one way to think about it. Should we add a clause like five years as part of the requirement for having university voting rights. And then that would not necessarily disqualify a lecturer who's been here a long time or whatever."

[Senator Hanson](#): "That was really going to be my point, is that we're conflating different things here. You could be represented by the senate as RTE faculty, and yet not be someone who has voting rights on your position. Those are two different things, and I'm actually wondering whether, when a resolution does go forward, whether that should be separated."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "Here is a practical thing: It would be quite easy for the department, the chair to know whether or not someone has five years. When we do elections, that's very complicated. You can partition people up by title; that's easy. But to do title and how long you've been here, I would say it's impossible. "So from the factual point of view, if we do the five-year thing, I think it would be easily implemented for department senators; but for the voting thing, it would be a nightmare, just to be honest."

[Senator Hanson](#): "What you just revealed, though, is about 600 people who have been here less than five years are going to be voting on --."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "I am sorry. You add up lecturers, extension associates and research associates, that number is 500. I have no clue about the five-year, what that means, in terms of numbers."

[Senator Hanson](#): "I see. Okay."

[Senator Tracy Stokol](#), Vet School: "I am Tracy Stokol, from Population Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences up at the Vet School. And a lot of people that I've spoken to have addressed the same concerns, particularly about the research associate title, because they really work under the auspices of a PI and are usually on soft money.

"I realize titles are used differently across colleges and a lot of people are in inappropriate titles that don't really reflect what they do; but as far as at the Vet School, I completely concur with Maureen about that they're considered a research equivalent to an instructor-level position, and that some serious consideration is to should they be voting in the senate.

"And there's a lot of people that think there should be some line drawn, whether it's five years, because you have illustrated longevity, as well as having gone through some vetting procedure, or you should just restrict it to the senior titles. I think either of those would be more acceptable than leaving it as currently is."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "One of the axioms -- I think those are fine arguments -- you can't have one set of rules for one college and another -- it has to be uniform across, so we have to address that, but those are good points."

[Senator Bensel](#): "The B requirement, five years, I was thinking about this in terms of our own membership now, and I like the idea, but we wouldn't impose it for faculty. And the reason we wouldn't do it -- ."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "You mean tenure track faculty."

[Senator Bensel](#): "Right. Tenure track faculty that won't have tenure wouldn't be represented in the senate under a rule like this, or almost unrepresented. So I like B, but I don't think we can even it out and apply it to our own membership, and so I reluctantly -- but I have another point, [Charlie](#), I think the two groups could meet in the same sessions and vote on those things in which we actually make decisions, like you; but on those things where we're advisory, the two groups could vote separately. And that would be information, then, that goes to the central administration in that way. I am worried about the quorum thing. I am skeptical, but those are just observations."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "There are two kinds of senators is to exaggerate. Well, suppose you have an RTE senator who really goes out of his or her way to reflect the department feeling on a particular issue. Now you take a roll call vote and you look at that RTE senator. It doesn't make any sense to say that's an RTE vote. It is a faculty vote, so it's kind of hard to -- the math is a little more complicated. "I want to get on to the fourth one, but there were a couple of more -- yeah. Incidentally, in terms of natural -- we don't legislate against assistant professors being in the senate. I think there are three or four, but it sort of happens that you don't come here."

[Senator Robert Karpman](#), member at-large: "At least in our college, lecturers and extension associates are vetted right from the beginning. There is search committees, et cetera, so I don't see why you need to have the five years, because they're vetted the same way as tenure track faculty."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "A good point, but that story's not repeated all over campus. That is the problem. If I have a big research grant and I want to bring in a research associate, hardly anyone's going to look, so they are all different levels. Don't forget, we can also do things by bully pulpit or strong advice as well."

"One last one on this thing? Then let's get on to the ratio."

"This stated in math terms: Do we need legislation to prevent an RTE majority? I mentioned this a couple times; natural forces are at work to say you don't have

to worry about this. Indeed, both faculties are just as busy. RTE faculty have sort -- many of them have an additional excuse to stiff the chair, which is it's not in my job description. A tenure track faculty member is expected to do some amount of service, so you can't say service is not in my job description. RTE faculty can.

"Anyway, there are a bunch of natural forces out there that say, what we felt on the committee, you don't have to legislate against this; but suppose you are nervous about that. We are all extremely busy. Will the senate be outsourced to RTE faculty? If that's your concern, here are three things you can do or we could change to guard against that.

"The first is to prevent departments from sending an RTE senator. In other words, we would just have those 20 RTE-only seats apportioned among the colleges. That would ensure that the ratio is at least four, five.

"The second one is mathematical, but a little more complicated. A, you happen to have -- you want to send an RTE faculty member to the senate. You can do it only if that person in your department was one of these elected college RTE folks. That would ensure, then, that the maximum number of RTE faculty is 20.

"A department then can have an RTE representative or, if they want, in our department, you're a college RTE person and we also have a tenure track person. There is one kind of complicated way of ensuring the ratio is at least four.

"Here is a more heuristic one, which is this: A department RTE senator's term ends. The next person to occupy that seat has to be a tenure track person. That would more or less ensure the ratio at least would be one; probably one much higher than that. So what we need here is a reading; how nervous should we be about this, and is it necessary to build in some mechanism.

"I should say in our study of what goes on at other universities, this is the only one where it's unbounded. It could conceivably be, like 20 years from now, solid RTE, if you worry about that. Most places, it's so many seats here, so many for that. Let us have an open discussion. How nervous should we be about this and should we do something about it?"

[Senator Stokol](#): "So the people I've spoken to are feeling concerned about this, because it is a possibility, regardless that it's a remote possibility. Say, for instance, the Vet School is eight senators currently, and would have an additional three senators, based on the allocated proportions, which means that we could have eleven senators, none of whom are university faculty, if this goes through as is.

"And with tenure track faculty having a lot of responsibilities, not saying more or less, but different responsibilities than RTE faculty, that could absolutely happen at our college, and I'm telling you that is a case, and that is something

that we're fairly concerned about and don't think should happen, because this body still needs to be independent.

"And the only true independent voices are those who are tenured. I am not saying that means you need to restrict this to tenured faculty, but these are the concerns that have been expressed and shared by a lot of the faculty, which I've shared with you, [Charlie](#), as you well know.

"And also, you, yourself said that when there is RTE representation on the faculty senate at other institutions, and please correct me if I'm misquoting you, that there isn't the possibility that they can be the majority in the senate. Not that they want to be, but that the possibility exists, and it certainly exists with the current proposal."

[Dean Van Loan](#): "The proposal is unique in that way. I would sort of say this, and it gets back to the natural forces at work; if, in fact, there's a huge outsourcing to the RTE faculty, then I would say the university faculty has really, in a certain sense, given up.

"I know you're saying -- but it is our job to be leaders in all matters that concern teaching and research, and that in part means showing up here and weighing in on stuff. I just can't see that happening, but again, we need more comments on this."

[Senator Buz Barstow](#), Biological and Environmental Engineering: "I guess I'm one of the few assistant professors in the room. You just said that our job as faculty is to be thought leaders. And to follow up on Maureen's point, an issue that keeps coming up in my mind when reflecting on this is how would this change from having a faculty senate that's composed purely of tenured faculty to one that's more inclusive? How would that affect sort of the stature with which we hold the tenure process?"

[Dean Van Loan](#): "I think when you have tenure, you have many fringe benefits. I don't think belonging to the senate is up there in the top three or anything like that.

(LAUGHTER)

"The right to do long-term research, the right to push people away, I'm doing my thing, a whole host of critical things, I will teach my class my way; there's a ton of stuff like that. In here, we don't get up and say I'm an associate professor or this is my chair. You just get up and you say something, and that's how we value stuff.

"We are kind of running out of time here. Someone who hasn't spoken yet."

[Senator Carl Franck](#), Physics: "This concern was expressed to me. Because we are running low on time, I wanted to slip in the concern about the research associates who are not inside of departments."

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Yeah, the question is not -- we have big labs out there. There are about 100 RTE faculty sitting in some of the big labs, and I have had a dialogue with Chris Meyer about how this can be handled. They can actually go through -- well, we'll take it off-line. One more, then we have to do the --.”

[Senator Robert Karpman](#): “Wasn't one of the parts of the resolution saying all of this was going to be re-evaluated in three years? And if that was the case, why are we arguing this, if we're going to re-evaluate it in three years?”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “Because it's hard to roll back stuff. Like the February break, we tried to get rid of that; but once it's in there, you can't go back. It is very hard to say oh, you'll be in the senate, then after three years, no, you can't. We really have to try to get it very right here, perhaps be more conservative and then, in three years, liberalizing, if things go well.”

[Senator Mackowski](#): “I think there are slightly different forces. One is our ethical sense of being inclusive and a representative body, and the other, a different kind of natural forces. In 40 years, the percentage of tenure track faculty has gone from 80% to 40% at universities worldwide, so that kind of natural force. And I think it's also important to keep in mind or perhaps it is to keep in mind our commitment to the tenure --.”

[Dean Van Loan](#): “The profession, yeah. That is all we have time for. You will hear from me. If those of you who have ideas and want to propose motions for the February meeting, we could have a dialogue in the next two months. Anyway, thank you very much. It has been very useful.”

(APPLAUSE)

[Speaker Nelson](#): “We just have a little bit -- a few things left. One is, we need a discussion about the one-year extension of dean of faculty term. Chris, will you come up?”

5. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF DEAN OF FACULTY TERM - [SLIDES](#) - [CHRIS SCHAFFER](#), ASSOCIATE DEAN OF FACULTY

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): “Good afternoon, everyone. I have asked [Charlie](#) to leave the room for this discussion. From the university bylaws, the dean of faculty is elected for a three-year term, and the faculty senate may choose to extend that term for a period of not to exceed two years. And then this action -- then the executive committee, I think that's the UFC or maybe that's the executive committee of the board, approves it.

“I would like to propose that we extend [Charlie Van Loan's](#) appointment as dean of faculty for one year. There are two primary reasons to do this. The first is there's several projects that [Charlie](#) has led and have been initiated in the last six months or so, and I think he would like to see them through to their completion.

"The second is there's a lot of turnover in the dean of faculty office right now, so with Karen Lucas leaving, it would be nice to have someone who could sort of shepherd things through that transition.

"Also right now, we have the dean of faculty and the associate dean of faculty elections are coincident and, in fact, our bylaws ask that whenever possible, we try to stagger those elections; so that, again, with the goal of trying to have some overlap and continuity through elections of different folks. I am currently serving as associate dean of faculty.

"My three-year term will end this summer, and it's not my intention to run for another term or to ask this body to extend. I will be, shortly after this, going on sabbatical and will see you when I get back.

"First, I'd like to open the floor for discussion about this notion to extend [Charlie Van Loan's](#) appointment as dean of faculty for one year."

[Senator Charlie Walcott](#): "Why not two years?"

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "[Charlie](#) has agreed to a one-year -- he's willing to serve. Any other discussion?"

[Professor Paul Soloway](#), Biomedical Sciences. "I was one of the candidates when [Charlie](#) won that election. I could not have done a better job.

"He is outstanding, and I'm grateful for the fact that we voted for him, instead of me." (APPLAUSE)

[Associate Dean Schaffer](#): "As they say, I sort of have a sense of the room, so I think I'll just call for a voice vote here. All in favor of extending [Charlie's](#) dean of faculty appointment by a year, please say "aye." (Ayes.) Any opposed? Any abstentions? Great, thank you. That passes."

[Speaker Nelson](#): "The last thing on the agenda is the Good and Welfare, and there isn't any, as far as I know. I am sure there's some good and there's some welfare somewhere in this room; but at that, I'd like to adjourn the meeting. Thank you. Meeting Adjourned."