

Minutes of the Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting
Wednesday October 21st, 2015
12-1 Faculty Room, 207 Low Library

1. Introductory Remarks: EVP David Madigan:

- Announcement of the event to recognize Faculty Distinction that was to be held on Thursday, October 22nd 4-6 in Low Rotunda.
- Reminder of the Faculty Diversity Dinner that was to be held for chairs of departments and search committees on Thursday, October 29th.
- Announcement that the Trustees had approved the renaming of the School of Continuing Education, which was henceforth to be known as the School of Professional Studies.
- Announcement of the formation of an Arts and Sciences committee, chaired by EVP Madigan, to explore plans for A&S acquisition of Uris Hall when that space would be vacated by the Business School.

2. Report on the activities of the Policy and Planning Committee, delivered by the PPC chair for 2015-16, David Schiminovich:

The PPC had begun work in 2015-16 on a variety of items on which faculty opinion would be sought in this and subsequent meetings. Chief among these items for 2015-16 were (i) the future of Uris Hall under A&S Stewardship; (ii) consideration of the tenure and promotion process; (iii) the A&S budget; (iv) the utilization and salary of adjunct instructors; and (v) the A&S Initiative process.

3. Then the introductory framing of three PPC issues:

A: Proposal for the modification to the Stated Rules of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

The Stated Rules had last been amended as of April 7th, 2010, in response to the ARC report on faculty governance and to the presentation of those ARC findings at the faculty meeting of February 11th, 2010. The key adjustment in 2010 was the creation of the PPC to replace ECFAS (i.e., Executive Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences). The new rules applying to the PPC were at that point left in some ways vague and open to adjustment as the new governance system evolved. Hence the focus now (in October 2015) on the need for the closer definition of such rules, especially in the areas of (i) the stated terms and policies of election to the PPC (a

problem here was that the current wording expected new members of the PPC to commit to a three-year term of service without leaves, an expectation that had not been met in practice thus far in the PPC's existence); and (ii) the election of the chair and vice-chair of the PPC. The terms of membership of the A&S faculty also warranted scrutiny, as did the (now seemingly defunct) role of the Secretary of the faculty, one of whose duties was to take minutes of faculty meetings (a member of the PPC was currently assigned to this duty). Amendments to the existing rules would need to be approved by a majority of the votes of the entire faculty.

Procedures moving forward: at a subsequent faculty meeting or possibly in an on-line forum, proposed changes to the current Stated Rules would be announced and voted upon. The aim above all was to ensure that in its own practices or election and self-management, the PPC acted in strict accordance with, and not in violation of, its own rules.

When Professor Schiminovich invited general comment on the Stated Rules question from those faculty present at today's meeting, none was forthcoming.

B: Uris Hall.

This substantial space consisted of 200 offices, 120 for faculty. At some 120,000 square feet, this space would add 15% to the current space available to A&S on the Morningside campus, whose capacity is currently some 825,000 square feet. EVP Madigan was to set up a committee, chaired by him, to consider possible uses of the building as and when it became available to A&S.

- There was as yet no plan at either the A&S or Provostial level for any use of the Uris space, and no budget for possible expenses involved in any A&S refurbishment and reallocation of that space.
- The monument outside Uris was currently being refurbished at the Business School's expense; the Provost suggested that EVP Madigan might send a note of thanks to the Dean of the Business School in recognition of this generous action.
- In terms of timeline, the Business School would be moving to Manhattanville no sooner than five years hence at the earliest.
- An update on Uris Hall developments would be given at the next faculty meeting.

C: Tenure and Promotion procedures.

An introduction to this matter was offered by Professor Marc van de Mierop, current member of the PPC.

- The new process of A&S tenure assessment via the PTC and in coordination with TRAC had been initiated some four years ago. The PPC had sensed some faculty

- dissatisfaction at this structure; but was this perception accurate or misleading? The PPC proposed to investigate the question by establishing a subcommittee charged with soliciting faculty opinion.
- *The goal of the inquiry* was essentially one of fact-finding so as to determine what problems are perceptible within the current tenure/promotion structure; the focus was to be not on analysis of the success/failure rate of cases managed under the present system, but on the inner mechanics of the system.
 - *How the inquiry would be conducted*: members of the PPC would seek the opinions of departmental chairs in the three divisions of the Sciences, the Social Sciences and the Humanities. For efficiency, in each of the three divisions members of the PPC would attend a chairs' meeting as routinely overseen by the given divisional dean.
 - When Professor van de Mieroop invited comment from the faculty, Professor Rosalind Morris noted that she had chaired a committee some ten years ago that had reviewed the tenure process. Four issues had then warranted attention: (i) the protracted length of the process; (ii) lack of transparency about decision-making; (iii) lack of clarity about the appeals process; and (iv) the complex relationship of problems with the tenure process to issues of equity and diversity within the faculty. For Professor Morris, all four issues remained problematic; in response, Professor van de Mieroop asserted that they would be taken fully into account in the incipient inquiry.
 - Vice-Provost Christopher Brown welcomed the initiative to examine the tenure and promotion procedures. His office had already tracked the time to completion in tenure cases under the new system, and noted that there was acceleration in comparison with the former system.
 - Professor Allison Busch sought clarification of why the former system was overhauled in favor of the current system. Professor van de Mieroop briefly reconstructed his understanding of the transition.

When general comment on the tenure/promotion question was requested from faculty present at today's meeting, none was forthcoming.

4. *Other issues.*

None was raised, and after a motion to adjourn the meeting, the proceedings were duly concluded at 12.54 p.m.