

## Minutes

April 27, 2010

### Meeting of the Faculty with the Provost's *ad hoc* Committee on Tenure and Faculty Development Policies

Members of the Committee: David Kertzer (Chair), Susan Alcock, Sheila Blumstein, Barry Connors, Sharon Krause, Charles Larmore, Govind Menon, Arto Nurmikko, Tricia Rose, Andy van Dam, Rajiv Vohra (Dean of the Faculty), and Edward Wing (Dean of Medicine and the Biological Sciences).

Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) moderator of the meeting, welcomed the faculty to the last discussion forum before the scheduled May 4 vote on five linked motions to change the Faculty Rules in accordance with the Committee's recommendations on Tenure and Faculty Development Policies. Professor Krause announced that although this was not an official Faculty Forum, the discussion would be operating under FEC rules, which prohibit students from being present except for a pre-approved BDH reporter.

Anita Zimmerman (BioMed, Molecular Pharmacology, Physiology & Biotechnology [MPPB]) asked why it was not a Faculty Forum, with the Chair of the Faculty Forum as an independent moderator.

Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) responded that there is an independent minutes taker (the Secretary of the Faculty Forum) and it was felt that an open discussion was better.

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) made reference to the Committee's meetings with groups of faculty over the last month and their healthy, vigorous discussions and debates. As a result, she said, the Committee made some modifications to their proposals, two of which would be discussed today. She lauded the community discussions about Brown's values and aspirations, discussions which are not easy but are valuable. Today, she said, the Committee would present specific proposals as motions to be voted on next week (May 4), to give faculty a chance to respond. She introduced the Committee members present on stage, including Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member), Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member), Provost David Kertzer, Rajiv Vohra (Dean of the Faculty), Govind Menon (Applied Mathematics; Ad Hoc Committee member), and Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member), and she noted that not all the Committee members could be present. She thanked Elizabeth Bryan for taking minutes. The procedure, she said, would be for each of the five motions to be presented by a Committee member, with discussion to follow.

Andrea Simmons (Psychology and Neuroscience; Chair, Nominations Committee) asked whether faculty could ask questions about the report as whole or only respond to individual motions?

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) said the discussion was open to questions of all sorts, but that she would try to keep the discussion on track.

Anita Zimmerman (BioMed, Molecular Pharmacology, Physiology & Biotechnology [MPPB]) asked question about the content of the motions: where a deadline in the tenure procedure has changed, for example from November to April, in which academic year is the new deadline? Is it next April or last April? She said that she didn't understand many changes like that in the proposed motions. Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that her understanding was that the calendar would be started anew. Rajiv Vohra (Dean of the Faculty; Ad Hoc Committee member) pointed to page 5, Motion 2, Faculty Rules Part 4: Section 10.I.D.6.a.i, which says "No later than November 1" to be changed to "No later than April 15." Anita Zimmerman (BioMed, MPPB) asked whether that was an extension of time or shortening of time? The answer given was "a shortening of time."

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) introduced Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) who would present the first motion.

Professor Alcock read the motion, which changes the method of election to TPAC. Proposed new language for Faculty Rules, Part 1, Section 2.VI.B.3 reads:

Each year a ballot will be prepared with two faculty members per vacant position. Candidates for each slate are to be chosen by the Committee on Nominations in consultation with the Provost after seeking nominations from the voting faculty. Candidates should be representative of the divisions of knowledge in the University and diversity in the Faculty.

The Committee's goal, Professor Alcock said, was to get the best slate of candidates for TPAC, faculty who would emphasize the tripartite nature -- teaching, service, and scholarship -- in exemplifying excellence. The addition of the Provost to the nominations process had advantages, the Committee felt: he is the chief academic officer of the University and thus has good global knowledge to identify faculty candidates; he currently acts for the APC and URC in this way; he would help to get the best possible people. This change would bring TPAC into line with the APC and URC language in the Faculty Rules, Professor Alcock said.

Anita Zimmerman (BioMed, MPPB) asked who wins if there is a dispute between the Provost and the faculty Nominating Committee?

The answer given was "the Nominating Committee."

Hal Roth (Religious Studies) said he didn't know why such a change to TPAC was necessary; why did the Committee feel it necessary to make this change? The faculty on TPAC worked hard --they considered maybe 100 cases per year -- and TPAC has been demonstrably a high quality, serious, engaged committee. He asked whether the Ad Hoc Committee felt this addition of the Provost was related to the NEASC report's implication that the tenure rate was too high? He asked if the Ad Hoc Committee saw this Motion as the solution to the perceived problem of the tenure rate?

Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) answered that it was soup to nuts. All the changes would make the process the most robust possible.

Corey Walker (Africana Studies) said that by that logic, there was no reason to limit consultation with the Nominating Committee to the Provost. Why not the President? Both were *ex officio* members of TPAC, he pointed out. In further exchange with Ad Hoc Committee member Susan Alcock, Professor Walker critiqued the rationale, saying that the motion betrayed the rationale by saying only the singular provost should have influence over the slate of candidates.

Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) responded that the Provost is the chief academic officer of the University, and that surely tenure is one of the most important things he oversees.

Ed Ahearn (Comparative Literature, French) referenced his remarks in the April 13 Faculty Forum. He stated that this is only one set of motions that increase the role of administration in faculty governance, and that this is not satisfactory. TPAC is one committee that is at the heart of faculty governance, with its functions on tenuring, and the motion, he said, strikes at the heart of faculty governance in his opinion.

Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) responded that many in the administration are faculty, who will return to the faculty when their administrative terms are finished. She said that it is important to think globally to the faculty as a whole, and that she wanted to push back on the idea that this motion hands power over to the administration.

Nancy Jacobs (Africana Studies, History) said that it is not good practice to allow the Provost to influence TPAC at both ends of the process, and that allowing the Provost more involvement would be inappropriate.

James Green (History and Brazilian Studies) said that when he came to Brown, he was struck by seeing much less democratic participation by faculty than he experienced at other schools. He spoke to the importance of thinking about how power relations play out on every level at the University, from relations between students and professors to relations in faculty governance. Given that at the end of the day, the Provost can veto a tenure case, he said, voting for this motion would give the Provost more power. Professor

Green named a question that he saw not being addressed: Significant honest concern by faculty is not being listened to. He said that he had not seen Brown faculty push back like this in his six years on the faculty, and he assessed the theme of this meeting and Committee's initiative to be that Brown faculty are being more and more ignored, with a concentration of power in the administration.

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that the Ad Hoc Committee had heard those concerns, in forums and individually, and that the Committee has tried to address them in a couple of ways, to change the language of the motion so that the Provost's role is consultative, not a veto, and to recognize the unique power of persuasion and perspective that the Provost holds.

Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) put importance on the rationale behind the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations, and noted that there are other models worse.

James Green (History and Brazilian Studies) reiterated his point that people were saying that they want more democratic processes.

Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) reiterated the Committee's revised recommendation that the Provost play a consultative role in selection of TPAC candidates.

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) said at this point that they would collect such questions and then move the discussion forward.

Maggie Bickford (History of Art and Architecture) said that the involvement of the Provost in the slate of TPAC candidates profoundly compromises the committee. She said that the involvement of major administrators has a chilling effect on the TPAC committee which affects both the discourse and the votes in individual cases. It is not possible for the Provost to be merely consultative. The Provost has power to make people on the committee think twice before speaking their minds.

Jim Simmons (Neuroscience) said that this kind of proposal could only have come about because someone on the TPAC committee was thought to be not right, and he wanted to know what exactly we're talking about. He said he understood that no names should be named, but what is it about faculty choices for TPAC membership that is perceived to be a problem?

Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that obviously, naming names was a bad idea. Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member) offered one way to say it: have we always gotten the faculty who are the best teachers, scholars, citizens? Is it the case that 100% of the TPAC membership fulfills the model of Brown faculty excellence?

Andrea Simmons (Psychology and Neuroscience; Chair, Nominations Committee) asked what exactly are the criteria? What do you mean by excellence? Speaking as Chair of the Nominations Committee, Professor A. Simmons said also that the Ad Hoc Committee's comment that it is easier to fill TPAC if the Provost is involved is not true in her experience. She said that the Nominating Committee has more volunteers than they need to fill TPAC. She asked again what were the specific objective criteria that the Ad Hoc Committee and the Provost looked for in TPAC membership.

Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) read some language from the report and said they did not want to get so specific as to spell out a number of books published.

Andrea Simmons (Psychology and Neuroscience; Chair, Nominations Committee) asked, so what is it? She said that she didn't like the innuendo about faculty colleagues.

Ruth Colwill (Psychology) asked whether the Ad Hoc Committee was saying that you cannot tell from a faculty member's CV? She proposed just posting the CVs of TPAC candidates, and she asked why the solution proposed is to give the Provost the power to select candidates. She posed the scenario that if a new provost who knows no one comes to Brown, "what are we going to do?"

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that posting CVs is a good suggestion. Given the need to allow time for discussion of other motions, she moved to the next motion and introduced Ad Hoc Committee member Sheila Blumstein to present Motion 2.

Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that she would not read Motion 2, which focuses on changes to the Faculty Rules concerning the Tenure Review itself, but faculty should feel free to ask questions, and she would identify some of the changes that the Ad Hoc Committee made after the recent faculty discussions. One change involves showing the list to the candidate. Another change is that the Dean (of the Faculty or of Medicine and Biological Sciences) can only add names of outside tenure evaluators, not eliminate any names. The number of external evaluators' letters was reduced from 10 to 8. The role of CFED in reviewing cases is unchanged, now. Candidates will not be informed of the actual vote tally in negative decisions (on the rationale that in small departments revelation of the vote would stimulate problematic guessing). Professor Blumstein asked for questions.

A faculty member repeated his objections, voiced at the 4/13 Faculty Forum, to a greater role of the Provost. He opposed more of a role for the Provost because of the cumulative increase of the administration's influence on a tenure candidate's case. He said that this was unacceptable, and that it is very disturbing that this is being proposed. He made a second point about a problematic lack of transparency that would result from not communicating the vote totals and from the elimination of sharing the final list of tenure referees with the candidate. He said that all of these measures decrease the role of the faculty, and increase secrecy.

Govind Menon (Applied Mathematics; Ad Hoc Committee member) offered to give his impressions about these matters. Faculty said they preferred facts.

The question was raised whether other institutions show the final list of tenure referees to the tenure candidate.

Ruth Colwill (Psychology) cited the University of Pennsylvania and said that they provide the tenure candidate with a list of referees, but the candidate is not told who actually writes.

Provost Kertzer said the Ad Hoc Committee had not been able to find such a case.

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) proposed to call on faculty with raised hands.

Naoko Shibusawa (History) asked for an explanation of the recommended deletion of the words "are well acquainted with" [the candidate's scholarship], regarding external tenure evaluators in Part 4. Section 10.I.D.6.a.iv on page 7. Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member) said to look at number ix, which proposes to delete similar wording. Professors Shibusawa and Blumstein continued a dialogue about the motion's proposal to change language about field expertise to the adjective "appropriate" in regard to external evaluators of a candidate's scholarship. Professor Shibusawa asked whether the rationale was to give more flexibility to the Tenure Committee and the Dean, and whether the assumption was that a tenure evaluator would have expertise in the field? Professor Blumstein drew a distinction between being familiar with the specific work of the candidate, and being knowledgeable in the field. Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that this distinction might be field specific; "already acquainted" would not be a requirement in all disciplines and fields.

A faculty member said that we're missing the point, and that the administration and the Ad Hoc Committee were dodging the issue. The process of tenure is not democracy, he said, and what the faculty want to talk about is what we're doing well and what not so well, and what is the evidence for that?

Michel-André Bossy (Comparative Literature, French) asked, does this mean dossiers will be entirely in the Dean's office? Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member) said no. Professor Bossy asked, why then can the Chair not do this? Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member) responded that there is a concern about consistency across departments. Corey Walker (Africana Studies) said that a template exists for letters to external tenure evaluators. A faculty member who is also on TPAC said that letters are not consistent, despite the template. Professor Bossy asked whether letters' differences might be due to different fields?

A faculty member asked about the number of additional letters the Dean could request. Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that the reason this provision was added was to provide another potential venue. She said that sometimes when the letters come in there is not enough breadth, or there might be several from one institution, or no international letters; in those cases, the Ad Hoc Committee hopes the Dean might solicit letters. Concerning the Dean having power, Professor Blumstein said that the process will still be a vote by the department, then TPAC. The Dean does not make a recommendation. He would only be soliciting letters that would go to the department. The department can say they have a problem with the letter, and the record of that goes to TPAC.

Anita Zimmerman (BioMed, Molecular Pharmacology, Physiology & Biotechnology [MPPB]) proposed as an alternative, why couldn't the Dean go back to the department and ask for balancing letters? She asked why does the Dean come up with the additional names of letter writers, rather than going back to the department?

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that's what the Ad Hoc Committee envisioned.

Professor Zimmerman (BioMed [MPPB]) responded, but that's not what it says.

Another faculty member said that one could imagine a dean asking an inappropriate person for a letter, a person who might not respond.

Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) said absolutely not. A department can offer its view; a non-response might or might not mean something; also that that is something TPAC could consider.

The same faculty member doubted whether the Dean has the knowledge to identify people in the field, in general.

Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) responded that clearly the Dean is not expected to be expert in every field -- that's why "dean consulting with department" is the idea.

The same faculty member said that in the best case it could be a good idea, but in the worst case, not.

Cathy Zerner (History of Art and Architecture) said she was still confused by the language in iv and ix about competence of reviewers. In a hypothetical case before TPAC of someone getting tenure from somewhere else vs. someone who had come up through the ranks, what would "appropriate" external evaluators be for the outside person? It wasn't clear. The university makes almost 50/50 senior appointments -- some for other jobs in the university, for example a head of a center. What is appropriate in such a case?

Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member) responded that it would be whatever was appropriate to the department where the appointee will be tenured.

Professor Zerner said that she still didn't know why the Ad Hoc Committee got rid of the "field" expertise.

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) noted that there were three more proposals to discuss and that one more comment would be taken on Motion 2, but that she would invite follow-up questions and comments by email.

Ross Kraemer (Religious Studies, Judaic Studies) spoke about getting tenure review letters, and said that in small fields, finding people to write for tenure, and then other people to write for promotion to Full Professor, was difficult; need flexibility is needed to honor field needs. Professor Kraemer spoke to a second issue, of not allowing candidate to see the list of reviewers. She said that asking candidates ahead of time to imagine all those people out there whose axes you might have bored was too much to expect. There are fields where methodological differences are sharp, and such significant differences would probably not be known to a dean, but probably would be known in a department. If the goal is to be truly fair and appropriate, how do you do that if you don't let the candidate see the list? She would like to see some recognition that stolen spouses wouldn't be known about by a dean.

Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member) said to remember that letters would go to the department. She said that if you have one letter that is an outlier, that won't sink a tenure case. A faculty voice said "Oh yes it does. It just did."

Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) said a candidate should bring it up ahead of time, that it was hard to lose track of spouses.

Anita Zimmerman (BioMed, MPPB) said that it was easy, however, to lose track of biases in a field.

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) moved the discussion to Motion 3, and introduced Govind Menon (Applied Mathematics; Ad Hoc Committee member) to present Motion 3. Professor Menon pointed out the main feature of Motion 3, on page 11, to be a change of the probationary period to eight years, and the initial contract to a four-year term. He asked for questions.

Naoko Shibusawa (History) said she was disturbed having to rush through discussions of the motions, and that the meetings were not enough time. Secondly, she said that to be told that things will go to the department is not reassuring.

Corey Walker (Africana Studies) asked what research did the Ad Hoc Committee consult on the question of 8 years vs. 7 or any other number of years for the probation period?

A Committee member cited the situation of the medical school, and biomed at large: for them, it is harder and harder to get significant career markers in place in the current 7-year probation. University investments, startups etc., need more time; Brown is still one university, not separate tracks.

Mary Ann Doane (Modern Culture and Media) asked whether the Ad Hoc Committee considered whether the bar would be raised with increase of number of years? Professor Doane and committee members discussed this point, with the Committee seeing nothing in the proposal to change the departments' explicitly stated historical standards. Moderator Krause said the goal is to make processes that meet those standards. Provost Kertzer said that already they get people at different stages of their careers and that TPAC always has to look at where they are and how long they have held full-time appointments, so there is not a concern with absolute standards. Professor Doane responded that there is a process of departments to state standards, and she asked whether departments are going to be asked to rethink them.

Govind Menon (Applied Mathematics; Ad Hoc Committee member) said the Motion allows for flexibility of process, so that people can come up earlier if they wish.

Sheila Blumstein (Cognitive Science and Linguistics; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that as she saw it, the Ad Hoc Committee did this largely in respect of the sciences; what's changed is that before, labs were up in 6 months, and the new faculty member could then start; however, now 2 or 3 years pass before getting the first grant, so, depending on the startup to get going, the junior faculty member is just not ready to be reviewed at the end of three years. At the end of three years, it looks like nothing has been accomplished, but they have been doing what they were supposed to do; the need is for them to get to the place where a review will be reliable.

Rajiv Vohra (Dean of the Faculty) said it was not just in the sciences; when we evaluate an assistant professor after 3 years, really 2 years, it's not enough in humanities and social sciences as well; if you do agree a 4-year initial appointment is better than current practice, then the second contract extends the logic. It's not a question of whether 7 or 8 is the magic number.

A faculty member asked a specific question about people in the gap, assistant professors who have already missed the proposed new deadlines. Provost Kertzer said that everybody on a current 3 year term would be given an extra year, and would have the option. The same faculty member pressed the point, saying that if one did not want the extra year, one had already missed deadlines. She asked what the time line is?

Moderator Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) introduced Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) to present Motion 5, on TPAC operations.

Professor Larmore indicated the section of the Faculty Rules, Part 1, section 2.VI.B, that the Ad Hoc Committee recommend be altered to change TPAC to a 14-member, 2-

subcommittee Committee. He remarked that the Ad Hoc Committee had considered other models before settling on this recommendation. Other models included appointed or elected standing committees; ad hoc committees, either outside the department or outside the university, with expertise in a field. The Ad Hoc Committee decided not to recommend *ad hoc* committees, but tried to ensure that the people who evaluate the dossier know something about the candidate's field and its expectations. One of the main reasons why the Ad Hoc Committee wanted to divide TPAC into two parts was so that each subcommittee would know the field. A second goal was to divide the workload. Finally, he noted that he is told that TPAC itself is very dissatisfied with this restructuring, and he hoped current TPAC members would say what's wrong with the model.

Jim Morgan (Cognitive and Linguistic Sciences) spoke as a member of TPAC. He said that the sense of the TPAC membership was that dividing the committee into two subcommittees was not an appropriate division. He offered his own department to exemplify the disciplinary boundary-crossing that often is true of departments and fields: linguistics in some universities is in the humanities, in others in sciences. A philosopher might be more appropriate than a pharmacologist to review a linguistics case. The proposed subcommittee division, he felt, does not mirror or reflect the range and division of expertise needed.

Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that it has always been in TPAC's purview to call on experts from elsewhere in university -- if it turns out that a philosopher's opinion will be valuable, the standing subcommittee could ask one.

Professor Morgan said that that response did not answer the objection that the pharmacologist would not have expertise. He suggested that the intention of the recommendation was good but execution was poor. TPAC has used "super readers," which is a more flexible approach. A problem with the new recommendation is that it is too rigid.

Sharon Krause (Political Science; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that the Ad Hoc Committee had worried about other models, for example that *ad hoc* committees would be continuously shifting and would introduce too much variability.

Joan Richards (History) said that TPAC discussed splitting and voted against it at a meeting at which she wasn't present; on the following morning a number of members met, talked through the issues, and tried to come up with more positive ideas. One concern they had involved the implications for splitting the university; they thought it was not a good idea to officially split the university into sciences / humanities and social science. Among their suggested solutions: 1. TPAC does work too hard, true. Divide TPAC into a tenure part and a promotion part (renewals, promotions, lecturers) to cut down work; 2. Have two balanced TPACs, 16 members with two groups of 8, but not divided by sciences; 3. Continue experimentation within TPAC on how to organize TPAC's discussion to be fair.

Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that was interesting. He said that the Ad Hoc Committee's primary motivation was to concentrate expertise and knowledge in the decision process; he thought those members of TPAC who as a rule best

evaluate a case should be primary evaluators; these are not typical cases where expertise of candidate straddles division of TPAC subcommittees, and so one could have provisions to draw on expertise either of the other TPAC subcommittee or other faculty. TPAC as currently constituted does have pharmacologist evaluating a linguist -- so it wouldn't be any different.

Govind Menon (Applied Mathematics; Ad Hoc Committee member) put a question to TPAC member Joan Richards (History) about TPAC's current workload and functioning. Professor Richards said that TPAC is working at the edge of reasonableness -- perhaps more than it should -- and it has too much work.

Kenny Breuer (Engineering) spoke, also as a member of TPAC, against dividing across disciplines. He said that we are a college, and that even without literary expertise, as an engineer, for him to look at a literary case has value; he finds value in hearing his colleagues in literature weigh in on science cases. He said that maybe the balance should be shifted to ensure expertise on candidate's field, but there are ways to do that.

Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that the idea that dividing TPAC will induce division of the university is fantastical. Concerning Professor Breuer's statement about the value of an engineer on a literature case, Professor Larmore asked, value to whom? He said that fairness to the candidate, and the department, is the priority.

Kenny Breuer (Engineering) asked to respond. He said that each case is weighed clearly, and he said that the teaching component can be evaluated across disciplines.

Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) disagreed that teaching could be evaluated across the disciplines. Several faculty voices mentioned standard teaching evaluation forms.

Kenny Breuer (Engineering) said that there is a value to an outside view on strengths and weaknesses.

A faculty member supported the possibility of probing and interesting questions and observations being raised by faculty in other fields, and suggested that if you can convince an engineer about a literature case, then it must be a strong case.

Charles Larmore (Philosophy; Ad Hoc Committee member) said that it was not a matter of benefiting the TPAC membership.

Dore Levy (Comparative Literature) spoke to the question that the "pharmacologist" would review the "linguistics" case whether TPAC was split or not. The pharmacologist on a committee of 6 or 7 has more punch than the pharmacologist on a committee of 12 or 14, she said. Concerning the university college, she felt strongly that a TPAC split would split the community and that split would impact the candidate. She characterized TPAC workload in the spring like ants on a hot plate on a hot stove; she urged the faculty to find a way to stagger scheduling of cases, to ensure fairness.

Andrea Simmons (Psychology and Neuroscience; Chair, Nominations Committee) posed a question about fairness: Any change to TPAC not only impacts tenure, but also promotion to full professor. She asked whether the Ad Hoc Committee had met with Associate Professors to get their perspective?

Susan Alcock (Archaeology; Classics; Director of the Joukowsky Institute; Ad Hoc Committee member) said no, but that was an excellent point, and such meetings were on radar, to consider things like repeat letters.

Andrea Simmons (Psychology and Neuroscience; Chair, Nominations Committee) asked why are we rushing this? "On the radar" is good but not good enough. How will these recommendations affect the professional development of our Associate Professors?

Rajiv Vohra (Dean of the Faculty) said that it is fair to say that once done with this part, the Faculty are not done with everything; concerning letters and so forth, we can come back to that.

Andrea Simmons (Psychology and Neuroscience; Chair, Nominations Committee) asked when will we come back to it? if, say, the motion to change TPAC is passed?

Rajiv Vohra (Dean of the Faculty) said, in the fall.

Moderator Sharon Krause adjourned the discussion meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth J. Bryan (English)  
Secretary of the Faculty Forum